

A Lower Bound for the Circumference Involving Connectivity*

Zh.G. Nikoghosyan [†]

Institute for Informatics and Automation Problems
National Academy of Sciences
P. Sevak 1, Yerevan 0014, Armenia
E-mail: zhora@ipia.sci.am

July 15, 2009

Abstract

Let G be a graph, C a longest cycle in G and $\bar{p}$, $\bar{c}$ the lengths of a longest path and a longest cycle in $G \setminus C$, respectively. Almost all lower bounds for the circumference base on a standard procedure: choose an initial cycle C_0 in G and try to enlarge it via structures of $G \setminus C_0$ and connections between C_0 and $G \setminus C_0$ closely related to $\bar{p}$, $\bar{c}$ and connectivity κ . Actually, each lower bound obtained in result of this procedure, somehow or is related to κ , $\bar{p}$, $\bar{c}$ but in forms of various particular values of κ , $\bar{p}$, $\bar{c}$ and the major problem is to involve these invariants into such bounds as parameters. In this paper we present a lower bound for the circumference involving δ , κ and $\bar{c}$ and increasing with δ , κ and $\bar{c}$.

1 Introduction

We consider only finite undirected graphs without loops or multiple edges. A good reference for any undefined terms is [1]. The set of vertices of a graph G is denoted by $V(G)$; the set of edges by $E(G)$. For S a subset of $V(G)$, we denote by $G \setminus S$ the maximum subgraph of G with vertex set $V(G) \setminus S$. For a subgraph H of G we use $G \setminus H$ short for $G \setminus V(H)$.

Paths and cycles in a graph G are considered as subgraphs of G . If Q is a path or a cycle, then the length of Q , denoted by $|Q|$, is $|E(Q)|$. For Q a path, we denote $|Q| = -1$ if and only if $V(Q) = \emptyset$. Throughout the paper, each vertex and edge can be interpreted as cycles of lengths 1 and 2, respectively.

*The original version is preprinted in Transactions of the Institute for Informatics and Automation Problems of the NAS (Republic of Armenia) and Yerevan State University, Mathematical Problems of Computer Science 21 (2000) 129–155.

[†]G.G. Nicoghossian up to 1997

Let G be a graph and C a longest cycle in G . A cycle C is a Hamilton cycle if $G \setminus C = \emptyset$ and is a dominating cycle if $G \setminus C$ is edgeless. We use n to denote the order, δ the minimum degree and κ the connectivity in G . The length $|C|$, denoted by c , is called a circumference. The lengths of a longest path and a longest cycle in $G \setminus C$, will be denoted by $\bar{p}$ and $\bar{c}$, respectively.

Almost all lower bounds for the circumference base on a standard procedure: choose an initial cycle C_0 in a graph G and try to enlarge it via structures of $G \setminus C_0$ and connections between C_0 and $G \setminus C_0$ closely related to connectivity κ and $\bar{p}$, $\bar{c}$. Actually, each lower bound obtained in result of this procedure, somehow or is related to κ , $\bar{p}$, $\bar{c}$ but in forms of various particular values of κ , $\bar{p}$, $\bar{c}$ and the major problem in long cycles theory is to involve these invariants into such bounds as parameters.

The starting result in this area, due to Dirac [2], bases on the minimum degree δ .

Theorem A [2]. In every graph, $c \geq \delta + 1$.

The second result in the same paper [2] shows that under 2-connectedness the bound $\delta + 1$ in Theorem A can be replaced by $\min\{n, 2\delta\}$.

Theorem B [2]. In every 2-connected graph, $c \geq \min\{n, 2\delta\}$.

When $G \setminus C$ has a simple structure, namely is edgeless, Voss and Zuluaga [6] obtained the following.

Theorem C [6]. Let G be a 3-connected graph. Then either $c \geq 3\delta - 3$ or each longest cycle in G is a dominating cycle.

The first lower bound involving connectivity κ as a parameter has been appeared in 1981, by the author [3].

Theorem D [3]. Let G be a 2-connected graph. Then $c \geq \min\{n, 3\delta - \kappa\}$.

Further, the first two bounds involving $\bar{p}$ and $\bar{c}$ has been appeared in 1998 and 2000, respectively, again by the author [4],[5].

Theorem E [4]. Let G be a graph and C a longest cycle in G . Then $|C| \geq (\bar{p} + 2)(\delta - \bar{p})$.

Theorem F [5]. Let G be a graph and C a longest cycle in G . Then $|C| \geq (\bar{c} + 1)(\delta - \bar{c} + 1)$.

As a defect, the bound in Theorem D decreases as κ increases. The bounds in Theorems E and F have the same defect for $\bar{p} \geq (\delta - 2)/2$ and $\bar{c} \geq \delta/2$, respectively.

In this paper we present a lower bound for the circumference involving δ , κ and $\bar{c}$ and increasing with δ , κ and $\bar{c}$.

Theorem 1. Let G be a graph and C a longest cycle in G . Then $|C| \geq \frac{(\bar{c}+1)\kappa}{\bar{c}+\kappa+1}(\delta+2)$ if $\bar{c} \geq \kappa$ and $|C| \geq \frac{(\bar{c}+1)\bar{c}}{2\bar{c}+1}(\delta+2)$ if $\bar{c} \leq \kappa - 1$.

The result is sharp, as can be seen from the following family of graphs. Take $\kappa + 1$ disjoint copies of the complete graph $K_{\delta-\kappa+1}$ and join each vertex in their union to every vertex of a disjoint complete graph K_κ . This graph $(\kappa + 1)K_{\delta-\kappa+1} + K_\kappa$ is clearly not hamiltonian. Moreover, $c = \kappa(\delta - \kappa + 2)$ and $\bar{c} = \delta - \kappa + 1$, implying that $c = \frac{(\bar{c}+1)\kappa}{\bar{c}+\kappa+1}(\delta+2)$.

In view of Theorem 1, we believe the following is also true in terms of $\bar{p}$.

Conjecture 1. Let G be a graph and C a longest cycle in G . Then $|C| \geq \frac{(\bar{p}+2)\kappa}{\bar{p}+\kappa+2}(\delta+2)$ if $\bar{p} \geq \kappa - 1$, and $|C| \geq \frac{(\bar{p}+2)\bar{p}}{2\bar{p}+2}(\delta+2)$ if $\bar{p} \leq \kappa - 2$.

The next section is devoted to standard terminology. In section 3 we introduce some special definitions and convenient notations, where the notion of HC -extensions plays a central role in the sequel. In section 4 we investigate the main properties of HC -extensions and in the last section we prove our main result.

2 Terminology

An (x, y) -path is a path with endvertices x and y . Given an (x, y) -path L of G , we denote by $\vec{L}$ the path L with an orientation from x to y . If $u, v \in V(L)$, then $u\vec{L}v$ denotes the consecutive vertices on L from u to v in the direction specified by $\vec{L}$. The same vertices, in reverse order, are given by $v\overleftarrow{L}u$. For $\vec{L} = x\vec{L}y$ and $u \in V(L)$, let $u^+(\vec{L})$ (or just u^+) denotes the successor of u ($u \neq y$) on $\vec{L}$ and u^- denotes its predecessor ($u \neq x$). If $A \subseteq V(L)$, then $A^+ = \{v^+ \mid v \in A \setminus \{y\}\}$ and $A^- = \{v^- \mid v \in A \setminus \{x\}\}$. If Q is a cycle in G and $A \subseteq V(Q)$, then $\vec{Q}$, A^+ and A^- are analogously defined. For $v \in V(Q)$, $v\vec{Q}v$ will be interpreted as a vertex v . For $v \in V$, put $N(v) = \{u \in V \mid uv \in E\}$ and $d(v) = |N(v)|$.

3 Special Definitions

We begin introducing some special definitions and convenient notations. For the remainder of this section let a longest cycle C in a graph G and a longest cycle $H = u_1 \dots u_h u_1$ in $G \setminus C$ with $h = \bar{c}$ be fixed.

Definition 3.1. HC -extension; $T(u_i)$; $\overset{o}{u}$; $\hat{u}$.

Let $T(u_1), \dots, T(u_h)$ are vertex-disjoint $(u_i, \hat{u}_i)$ -paths in $G \setminus C$ ($i = 1, \dots, h$). The union $T = \bigcup_{i=1}^h T(u_i)$ is called *HC-extension* if $N(\hat{u}_i) \subseteq V(T) \cup V(C)$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$. An HC-extension T is called *maximal* if it is chosen so as to maximize $|\{u \in V(H) \mid u \neq \hat{u}\}|$. If $u \neq \hat{u}$ for some $u \in V(H)$, then we use $\overset{o}{u}$ to denote $u^+(\vec{T}(u))$.

Definition 3.2. (A, B) -path.

Let $A, B \subset V$ and $A \cap B = \emptyset$. Let E is a path in G with all its inner vertices in $V \setminus (A \cup B)$. Then E is called an (A, B) -path if E starts at any vertex in A and terminates at any vertex in B . For subgraphs H_1 and H_2 of G , an (H_1, H_2) -path is analogously defined.

Definition 3.3. $\Theta(\vec{P}, V_{neut}, V_{fin}) = (P_0, \dots, P_\pi)$; $P_i = y_i \vec{P}_i z_i$ ($i = 0, \dots, \pi$).

Let $V' \subset V$. A path with endvertices in $V \setminus V'$ and all internal vertices in V' is called a V' -path. Let $\vec{P} = v_0 v_1 \dots v_n$ be a path in G of length $n \geq 1$ and let V_{neut}, V_{fin} be vertex-disjoint subsets in $V \setminus V(\vec{P})$. We define $\Theta(\vec{P}, V_{neut}, V_{fin})$ as a sequence of paths $P_0, \dots, P_\pi$ as follows: For $i = 0$, put $P_0 = \overline{y_0 z_0}$ and $X = V(v_0 \vec{P} z_0)$, where $y_0 = v_0$ and $z_0 = v_1$. Now let $P_{i-1} = y_{i-1} \vec{P}_{i-1} z_{i-1}$ and X_{i-1} are defined for some integer $i \geq 1$. In order to define P_i and X_i we distinguish three cases.

(i) If every V_{neut} -path, starting in $X_{i-1} - z_{i-1}$, terminates in X_{i-1} , then $X_i = \emptyset$ and $P_\pi = P_{i-1}$ (so P_i is undefined).

(ii) If there is a V_{neut} -path $P' = v' \vec{P}' v''$ with $v' \in X_{i-1} - z_{i-1}$ and $v'' \in V_{fin}$, then $X_i = \emptyset$ and $P_\pi = P_i = y_i \vec{P}_i z_i$, where $y_i = v'$ and $z_i = v''$.

(iii) There is a V_{neut} -path $P'' = w' \vec{P}'' w''$ with $w' \in X_{i-1} - z_{i-1}$ and $w'' \in V(z_{i-1}^+ \vec{P} v_n)$ but there is no V_{neut} -path satisfying (ii).

Choose P'' so as to maximize $|v_0 \vec{P} w''|$. Then putting

$$P_i = y_i \vec{P}'' z_i, \quad X_i = V(v_0 \vec{P} z_i),$$

where $y_i = w'$ and $z_i = w''$, we complete the definition of P_i and X_i . Since $X_0 \subset X_1 \subset \dots$, there must be some integer j ($j \geq 1$) with $P_j = P_\pi$, which, in fact, completes the definition of $\Theta(\vec{P}, V_{neut}, V_{fin})$.

Definition 3.4. $\Phi_u; \varphi_u; \Psi_u; \psi_u$.

Let T be a maximal HC-extension. For each $u \in V(H)$, put

$$\Phi_u = N(\hat{u}) \bigcap V(T), \quad \varphi_u = |\Phi_u|,$$

$$\Psi_u = N(\hat{u}) \bigcap V(C), \quad \psi_u = |\Psi_u|.$$

Definition 3.5. $U_0; \overline{U}_0; U_1; U_2; U_*$.

For T a maximal HC-extension, put

$$U_0 = \{u \in V(H) \mid u = \hat{u}\}, \quad \overline{U}_0 = V(H) \setminus U_0, \quad U_1 = \{u \in \overline{U}_0 \mid \Phi_u \not\subseteq V(T(u))\}.$$

Let $u \in V(H) \setminus (U_0 \cup U_1)$ and $\Theta(\overleftarrow{T}(u), V_{neut}, V_{fin}) = (P_0, \dots, P_\pi)$, where

$$V_{neut} = V \setminus (V(T) \cup V(C)), \quad V_{fin} = V(T) \setminus V(T(u)).$$

A vertex u is called special if P_π starts and terminates in $V(T(u))$. The set of all nonspecial vertices in $V(H) \setminus (U_0 \cup U_1)$ is denoted by U_2 and the set of all special vertices by U_* .

Definition 3.6. $B_u; B_u^*; b_u; b_u^*$.

Let T be a maximal HC-extension. For each $u \in V(H)$, put $B_u = \{v \in U_0 \mid v \overset{o}{u} \in E\}$. Clearly $B_u = \emptyset$ if $u \in U_0$. Furthermore, for each $u \in U_0$, put $B_u^* = \{v \in V(H) \mid u \overset{o}{v} \in E\}$. Clearly $B_u^* \subseteq \overline{U}_0$. Let $b_u = |B_u|$ and $b_u^* = |B_u^*|$.

Definition 3.7. $A_u(v); \rho_u(v); \overline{\rho}_u(v); \Lambda_u; \Lambda_u(v, w)$.

Let T be a maximal HC-extension. For each $u, v \in V(H)$, put

$$A_u(v) = (\Phi_u \cup B_u) \cap V(T(v)).$$

Let $\rho_u(v)$ denote the vertex in $A_u(v)$ maximizing $|v \overrightarrow{T}(v) \rho_u(v)|$. In particular, $\rho_u(u) = \hat{u}^-$. Put $\overline{\rho}_u(v) = \hat{u}$ if $\rho_u(v) \in \Phi_u$ and $\overline{\rho}_u(v) = \overset{o}{u}$ if $\rho_u(v) \in B_u$. Clearly $\overline{\rho}_u(u) = \hat{u}$. Put $\Lambda_u = \{v \in V(H) \mid A_u(v) \neq \emptyset\}$. For each $v, w \in \Lambda_u$ ($v \neq w$), put

$$\Lambda_u(v, w) = vT(v)\rho_u(v)\overline{\rho}_u(v)T(u)\overline{\rho}_u(w)\rho_u(w)T(w)w.$$

Definition 3.8. $\varphi'_u; \gamma_u; \beta_u; \mu(T)$.

For T a maximal HC-extension, put

$$\varphi'_u = \begin{cases} \varphi_u & \text{if } u \in V(H) \setminus U_*, \\ 0 & \text{if } u \in U_*, \end{cases} \quad \gamma_u = \begin{cases} \varphi'_u + b_u & \text{if } u \in \overline{U}_0, \\ \varphi'_u - b_u^* & \text{if } u \in U_0, \end{cases}$$

$$\beta_u = \frac{(\gamma_u + \gamma_{u^+})}{2} \quad (u \in V(H)), \quad \mu(T) = \frac{1}{h} \sum_{u \in V(H)} \beta_u.$$

Definition 3.9. T -transformation; $T_{tr}(E_1, \dots, E_n); T_{tr}(v_1, \dots, v_n)$.

Let T be a maximal HC-extension and let $E_1, \dots, E_n$ are vertex-disjoint (H, C) -paths with $E_i = v_i \overrightarrow{E}_i w_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$). Assume that the union of $E_1, \dots, E_n$ intersect $T(z)$ for some $z \in V(H) \setminus \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$. Clearly $z \in \overline{U}_0$. walking along $T(z)$ from z to $\hat{z}$ we stop at the first vertex $w \in \bigcup_{i=1}^n V(E_i)$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $w \in V(E_1)$. Replacing the segment $v_1 E_1 w$ of a path E_1 by $zT(z)w$ we get a new path E_1^0 instead of E_1 . If the union of $E_1^0, E_2, \dots, E_n$ intersect $T(z')$ for some $z' \in V(H) \setminus \{z, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$, then continue this procedure. In a finite number of steps we obtain

$$|\{v \in V(H) : (\bigcup_{i=1}^n V(E_i^0)) \cap V(T(v)) \neq \emptyset\}| = n$$

for some vertex-disjoint (H, C) -paths $E'_1, \dots, E'_n$. Let $E'_i = v'_i E'_i w_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$). By writing

$$T_{tr}(E_1, \dots, E_n) = (E'_1, \dots, E'_n), \quad T_{tr}(v_1, \dots, v_n) = (v'_1, \dots, v'_n),$$

we say that $E'_1, \dots, E'_n$ is a T -transformation of $E_1, \dots, E_n$. By the definition,

$$v'_i \in \{v_i\} \bigcup \overline{U}_0 \quad (i = 1, \dots, n), \quad T_{tr}(w_1, \dots, w_n) = (w_1, \dots, w_n).$$

Definition 3.10. $O(x, y); O_x(x, y); O(y, \overset{\circ}{x}); O(x, \overset{\circ}{x}); O_y(x, y); O(x, \overset{\circ}{y}); O(y, \overset{\circ}{y})$.

Let T be a maximal HC -extension. For each pair of distinct vertices $x, y \in V(H)$, put

$$V_1 = \bigcup_{v \notin \{x, y\}} V(T(v)) \bigcup \{x, y\}, \quad V_2 = V_1 \bigcup \{\overset{\circ}{x}\}.$$

Let $O(x, y)$ (resp. $O_x(x, y), O(y, \overset{\circ}{x}), O(x, \overset{\circ}{x})$) be the longest (x, y) -path (resp. (x, y) -path, $(y, \overset{\circ}{x})$ -path, $(x, \overset{\circ}{x})$ -path) in $\langle V_1 \rangle$ (resp. $\langle V_2 \rangle, \langle V_2 \rangle, \langle V_2 \rangle$). The paths $O_y(x, y)$, $O(x, \overset{\circ}{y})$, and $O(y, \overset{\circ}{y})$ are analogously defined.

Definition 3.11. $\Omega(x, y); \Omega(x, y, E, F); \Omega(v, w, x, y, E, F)$.

Let T be a maximal HC -extension and let E, F be a pair of vertex disjoint T -transformed (H, C) -paths with $E = xEv$ and $F = yFw$. If $|T(x)| - 1 \neq 1$, then we denote $\Omega_x(x, y, E, F) = O(x, y)$. Otherwise,

$$\Omega_x(x, y, E, F) = \begin{cases} O_x(x, y) & \text{if } \overset{\circ}{x} \notin V(E) \bigcup V(F), \\ O(\overset{\circ}{x}, y) & \text{if } \overset{\circ}{x} \in V(E), \\ O(\overset{\circ}{x}, x) & \text{if } \overset{\circ}{x} \in V(F). \end{cases}$$

Define $\Omega_y(x, y, E, F)$ by the same way and denote by $\Omega(x, y, E, F)$ the longest path among $O(x, y), \Omega_x(x, y, E, F)$ and $\Omega_y(x, y, E, F)$. Let $\Omega(x, y)$ be the shortest path $\Omega(x, y, E, F)$ for fixed x, y and all possible E, F . By definition 3.9, $vE\mu\Omega(x, y, E, F)\nu Fw$ is a simple path for appropriate $\mu, \nu \in \{x, y, \overset{\circ}{x}, \overset{\circ}{y}\}$ denoted by $\Omega(v, w, x, y, E, F)$.

Definition 3.12. $(v, L) \in \Delta$.

Let L be a path in G with $L = v_1 \dots v_{2t-1}$ ($t \geq 1$) and let $v \in V \setminus V(L)$. We will write $(v, L) \in \Delta$ if $vv_{2i-1} \in E$ ($i = 1, \dots, t$). For $w \in V(L)$, we will write $(w, L) \in \Delta$ if $wu \in E$ for each $u \in V(L) \setminus \{w\}$.

Remarks. If no ambiguity can arise, any notation of the type R_{u_i} in definitions 2.4 and 2.6-2.8, having index u_i (say Φ_{u_i}), we abbreviate $R_{u_i} = R_i$.

4 Preliminaries

Throughout this section, let G be a graph, C be a longest cycle in G and $H = u_1 \dots u_h u_1$ a longest cycle in $G \setminus C$ with a maximal HC -extension T .

Lemma 1. Let G be a graph.

(a1) For E, F a pair of vertex-disjoint (H, C) -paths in G with $E = xEv$ and $F = yFw$, if $T_{tr}(E, F) = (E', F')$ and $T_{tr}(x, y) = (x', y')$, then

$$|v\overrightarrow{C}w| - 1 \geq |\Omega(v, w, x', y', E', F')| - 1 \geq a(x') + a(y') + |\Omega(x', y')| - 1,$$

where $a(z) = 1$ if $z \notin U_*$ and $a(z) = \varphi_z + 1$ if $z \in U_*$ for each $z \in \{x', y'\}$.

(a2) Let $u \in V(H)$ and $\Theta(\overleftarrow{T}(u), V_{neut}, V_{fin}) = (P_0, \dots, P_\pi)$, where $P_i = y_i \overrightarrow{P}_i z_i$ ($i = 0, \dots, \pi$) and

$$V_{neut} = V \setminus (V(T) \cup V(C)), \quad V_{fin} = V(T) \setminus V(T(u)).$$

If $u \in U_2$, then there is an (u, z_π) -path L of length at least $\varphi_u + 1$ with $V(L) \subseteq V(T(u)) \cup V^*$, where $V^* = \bigcup_{i=0}^\pi V(P_i)$. If $u \in U_*$, then for each vertex

$$z \in (V(\hat{u}\overleftarrow{T}(u)z_\pi) \cup V^*) \setminus \{z_\pi\}$$

there is an (u, z) -path L of length at least $\varphi_u + 1$ with $V(L) \subseteq V(T(u)) \cup V^*$.

Lemma 2. For each $u \in V(H)$,

- (b1) if $u \in \overline{U}_0$ and $\hat{u} \neq u$, then $\Phi_u \cap B_u = \emptyset$.
- (b2) $\sum_{u \notin U_0} b_u = \sum_{u \in U_0} b_u^*$, $\sum_{u \in V(H)} \gamma_u = \sum_{u \in V(H)} \varphi'_u$,
 $|\Phi_u \cup B_u| = \sum_{v \in V(H)} |A_u(v)|$.

Lemma 3. Let G be a graph, C be a longest cycle in G , Q be a path in $G \setminus C$ and let $P_i = v_i \overrightarrow{P}_i w_i$ ($i = 0, \dots, q$) are vertex-disjoint paths in $G \setminus C$ having only $v_0, \dots, v_q$ in common with Q . Then

$$c \geq \sum_{i=0}^q |Z_i| + \left| \bigcup_{i=0}^q Z_i \right|,$$

where $Z_i = N(w_i) \cap V(C)$ ($i = 0, \dots, q$).

Lemma 4. For each $u \in V(H)$,

- (d1) if $|T(u)| - 1 \geq 2$, then $h \geq 2\gamma_u$.
- (d2) if $|T(u)| - 1 = 1$, then $h \geq 2\varphi'_u \geq \gamma_u + 1$.
- (d3) $h \geq \gamma_u + 1$.

Lemma 5. Let $\Lambda_u \subseteq V(x\overrightarrow{H}y)$ for some $u, x, y \in V(H)$.

- (e1) if $|T(u)| - 1 \geq 2$, then $|x\overrightarrow{H}y| - 1 \geq \gamma_u$.
- (e2) if $|T(u)| - 1 = 1$, then $|x\overrightarrow{H}y| - 1 \geq \gamma_u - 1$.
- (e3) if $|T(u)| - 1 = 1$ and $|x\overrightarrow{H}y| - 1 = \gamma_u - 1$, then
 $(\hat{u}, x\overrightarrow{H}y) \in \Delta$, $B_u = \Lambda_u \setminus \{u\} \subseteq U_0$ and $\gamma_u - 1 = 2(\varphi_u - 1)$.

Lemma 6. For each $u \in U_1 \cup U_2$, let $x_1 \vec{H} y_1$ and $x_2 \vec{H} y_2$ be vertex-disjoint segments in H with $\{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2\} \subseteq \Lambda_u \subseteq V(x_1 \vec{H} y_1) \cup V(x_2 \vec{H} y_2)$ and let $v \in \{x_2, y_2\}$.

(f1) If $B_u \cup \{u\} \subseteq V(x_1 \vec{H} y_1)$ and $\Lambda_u \setminus (B_u \cup \{u\}) \subseteq V(x_2 \vec{H} y_2)$, then

$$|x_1 \vec{H} y_1| - 1 + |x_2 \vec{H} y_2| - 1 + |A_u(u)| + |A_u(v)| \geq \gamma_u - 1.$$

Otherwise,

$$|x_1 \vec{H} y_1| - 1 + |x_2 \vec{H} y_2| - 1 + |A_u(u)| + |A_u(v)| \geq \gamma_u - 2 + |A_u(u)| \geq \gamma_u - 1.$$

(f2) If $|x_1 \vec{H} y_1| - 1 + |x_2 \vec{H} y_2| - 1 + |A_u(u)| + |A_u(v)| = \gamma_u - 1$, then

$$(\hat{u}, x_i \vec{H} y_i) \in \Delta \ (i = 1, 2), \quad B_u = \Lambda_u \setminus \{u\} \subseteq U_0, \quad \gamma_u - 1 = 2(\varphi_u - 1).$$

Lemma 7. Let x, y be a pair of distinct vertices in H . For each $u \in V(H)$,

(g1) if $u \in U_*$, then $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_u + 1$,

(g2) if $|T(u)| - 1 \geq 2$, then $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_u$,

(g3) if $|T(u)| - 1 = 1$, then $|O_u(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_u - 1$,

(g4) Let $|T(u)| - 1 = 1$ and $|O_u(x, y)| - 1 = \gamma_u - 1$. If either $\Lambda_u \subseteq V(x \vec{H} y)$ and $(\overset{o}{u}, H) \notin \Delta$ or $\Lambda_u \subseteq V(y \vec{H} x)$ and $(\overset{o}{u}, H) \notin \Delta$ (say $\Lambda_u \subseteq V(x \vec{H} y)$ and $(\overset{o}{u}, H) \notin \Delta$), then

(g4.1) $(\overset{o}{u}, x \vec{H} y) \in \Delta$,

(g4.2) $B_u = \Lambda_u \setminus \{u\} \subseteq U_0$ and $|O_u(x, y)| - 1 = |x \vec{H} y - 1| = \gamma_u - 1 = 2(\varphi_u - 1)$,

(g4.3) if $z \in V(x \vec{H} y) \setminus \Lambda_u$, then either $z \in U_*$ or $z \in U_0$ and $\Lambda_z \subseteq \Lambda_u \cup \{z\}$, $\gamma_z \leq \varphi_u = (\gamma_u + 1)/2$,

(g4.4) if $z \in V(x \vec{H} y) \setminus \{x, y\}$, then $\Lambda_z \subseteq V(x \vec{H} y)$.

Otherwise,

(g4.5) $(\overset{o}{u}, H) \in \Delta$,

(g4.6) $B_u = \Lambda_u \setminus \{u\} \subseteq U_0$ and $|O_u(x, y)| - 1 = h - 2 = \gamma_u - 1 = 2(\varphi_u - 1)$,

(g4.7) if $z \in V(H) \setminus \Lambda_u$, then either $z \in U_*$ or $z \in U_0$, $\Lambda_z \subseteq \Lambda_u \cup \{z\}$ and $\gamma_z \leq \varphi_u = (\gamma_u + 1)/2 = h/2$,

(g5) if $|T(x)| - 1 = 1$, then $\min\{|O(\overset{o}{x}, x)| - 1, |O(\overset{o}{x}, y)| - 1\} \geq \gamma_x$.

(g6) if $u \in \{x^+, x^-, y^+, y^-\}$, then $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_u$,

(g7) If $u \in \{x^+, x^-, y^+, y^-\}$ (say $u = x^+$) and $|O(x, y)| - 1 = \gamma_u$, then $|T(u)| - 1 \leq 1$ and $(\hat{u}, v \vec{H} y) \in \Delta$ for some $v \in \Lambda_u$ with $\Lambda_u \subseteq V(v \vec{H} y)$,

(g8) If $|T(x)| - 1 = 1$ and $|O_x(x, y)| - 1 = |O_x(x, w)| - 1 = \gamma_x - 1$ for some $w \in V(H) \setminus \{x, y\}$, then for each $z \in \{x^+, x^-\}$,

$$\min\{|O_x(x, y)| - 1, |O_x(x, w)| - 1\} \geq \gamma_z + 1.$$

Lemma 8. Let x, y be a pair of distinct vertices in H and let

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \min\{|O_x(x, y)|, |O(\overset{o}{x}, y)|, |O(\overset{o}{x}, x)|\} - 1, \\ b &= \min\{|O_y(x, y)|, |O(\overset{o}{y}, x)|, |O(\overset{o}{y}, y)|\} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Then $|\Omega(x, y)| - 1 \geq \max\{|O(x, y)| - 1, a, b\}$.

Lemma 9. Let x, y be a pair of distinct vertices in H . Then

- (i1) if $\{u_i, u_{i+1}\} \cap \{x, y\} = \emptyset$ ($i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$), then $|\Omega(x, y)| - 1 \geq (\gamma_i + \gamma_{i+1})/2 = \beta_i$,
- (i2) if $|T(x)| - 1 \geq 2$ and $z \in \{x^+, x^-\}$, then $|\Omega(x, y)| - 1 \geq (\gamma_x + \gamma_z)/2$,
- (i3) if $x \in U_*$ and $z \in \{x^+, x^-\}$, then $|\Omega(x, y)| - 1 \geq (\gamma_x + \gamma_z + 1)/2$,
- (i4) If $|T(x)| - 1 = 1$, then for each $w \in V(H) \setminus \{x, y\}$ and $z \in \{x^+, x^-\}$,

$$\max\{|\Omega(x, y)| - 1, |\Omega(x, w)| - 1\} \geq (\gamma_x + \gamma_z)/2,$$
- (i5) if $z \in \{x^+, x^-\}$ and $w \in V(H) \setminus \{z\}$, then $\max\{|\Omega(x, y)| - 1, |\Omega(z, w)| - 1\} \geq (\gamma_x + \gamma_z)/2$,
- (i6) If $x \in \overline{U}_0$ and $h \neq 4$, then $|\Omega(x, y)| - 1 \geq (\gamma_x + \gamma_z)/2$ for some $z \in \{x^+, x^-\}$,
- (i7) if $x, y \in \overline{U}_0$, then $|\Omega(x, y)| - 1 \geq \max_i \beta_i$,
- (i8) if $|x\overrightarrow{H}y| - 1 = 1$, then $|\Omega(x, y)| - 1 \geq \max_i \beta_i$,
- (i9) if $|x\overrightarrow{H}y| - 1 = 2$ and $h \neq 4$, then $|\Omega(x, y)| - 1 \geq (\gamma_x + \gamma_{x^+})/2$.

5 Proofs

Proof of lemma 1. (a1) Following definition 3.11, we distinguish three cases.

Case 1. $x, y \notin U_*$.

Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} |v\overrightarrow{C}w| - 1 &\geq |\Omega(v, w, x, y, E, F)| - 1 \\ &\geq 2 + |\Omega(x, y, E, F)| - 1 \geq |\Omega(x, y)| + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2. $x, y \in U_*$.

If $|T(x)| - 1 = 1$, then $\overset{o}{x} \notin V(\Omega(x, y))$, since otherwise the segment of $\Omega(x, y)$ between $\overset{o}{x}$ and y , contradict the fact that $x \in U_*$. Therefore, $\Omega(x, y, E, F) = O(x, y)$. On the other hand, $\Omega_x(x, y, E, F) = O(x, y)$ if $|T(x)| - 1 \geq 2$. Also, by the symmetric arguments, $\Omega_y(x, y, E, F) = O(x, y)$. Thus $\Omega(x, y, E, F) = \Omega(x, y)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} |v\overrightarrow{C}w| - 1 &\geq |\Omega(v, w, x, y, E, F)| - 1 \\ &\geq (|E| - 1) + (|F| - 1) + |\Omega(x, y)| - 1 \geq \varphi_x + \varphi_y + |\Omega(x, y)| + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Case 3. Either $x \notin U_*, y \in U_*$ or $x \in U_*, y \notin U_*$.

Apply the arguments in case 1 and case 2. Δ

(a2) Suppose first that $u \in U_2$. By definition 3.3, $z_1 \in V(T(u))$ and $z_\pi \in V_{fin}$. Let $z_\pi \in V(T(w))$ for some $w \in V(H) \setminus \{u\}$. Choose $z_{01} \in V(u\overrightarrow{T}(u)y_2^-)$ such that $z_{01}\hat{u} \in E$ and $|z_{01}\overrightarrow{T}(u)y_2|$ is minimum. Then we get the desired result putting together the following paths

$$P_2, \dots, P_\pi, \hat{u}z_{01}, \hat{u}\overleftarrow{T}(u)y_2, z_{01}\overleftarrow{T}(u)y_3, z_{\pi-1}\overleftarrow{T}(u)u, z_i\overleftarrow{T}(u)y_{i+2},$$

where $i = 2, \dots, \pi - 2$. A similar proof holds for $u \in U_*$. Δ

Proof of lemma 2. (b1). Case 1. $u \in U_1$.

Suppose, to the contrary, that $\Phi_u \cap B_u \neq \emptyset$ and let $z \in \Phi_u \cap B_u$. Then, by definitions 3.4 and 3.1, the collection

$$\{T(u_1), \dots, T(u_h), u \overset{o}{u}, z\hat{u}\} \setminus \{T(u), T(z)\}$$

generates another HC -extension, contradicting the maximality of T .

Case 2. $u \in U_2 \cup U_*$.

By definition 3.5, $\Phi_u \subseteq V(T(u))$ and the result follows. Δ

(b2) Immediately from definitions 3.6-3.8. Δ

Proof of lemma 3. Assume first that $v_i = w_i$ ($i = 0, \dots, q$). The result is immediate if $\bigcup_{i=0}^q Z_i = \emptyset$. Let $\bigcup_{i=0}^q Z_i \neq \emptyset$ and let $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m$ ($m \geq 1$) be the elements of $\bigcup_{i=0}^q Z_i$ occuring on $\overrightarrow{C}$ in a consecutive order. Set

$$F_i = N(\xi_i) \cap \{w_0, \dots, w_q\} \quad (i = 1, \dots, m).$$

Suppose that $m = 1$. If $|F_1| = 1$, then $q = 0$ and $Z_0 = Z_q = \{\xi_1\}$ implying that

$$c \geq 2 = \sum_{i=0}^q |Z_i| + \left| \bigcup_{i=0}^q Z_i \right|.$$

If $|F_1| \geq 2$, then choosing $u, v \in F_1$ ($u \neq v$) such that $|u \overrightarrow{Q} v|$ is maximum, we get

$$c \geq |\xi_1 u \overrightarrow{Q} v \xi_1| \geq \sum_{i=0}^q |Z_i| + 1 = \sum_{i=0}^q |Z_i| + \left| \bigcup_{i=0}^q Z_i \right|.$$

Thus, we may assume $m \geq 2$. It means, in particular, that $c \geq 3$. For $i = 1, \dots, m$, put $f(\xi_i) = |\xi_i \overrightarrow{C} \xi_{i+1}| - 1$ (indices mod m). It is easy to see that

$$c = \sum_{i=1}^m f(\xi_i), \quad \sum_{i=1}^m |F_i| = \sum_{i=0}^q |Z_i|, \quad m = \left| \bigcup_{i=0}^q Z_i \right|. \quad (1)$$

For every $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, choose $x_i, y_i \in F_i \cup F_{i+1}$ such that $|x_i \overrightarrow{Q} y_i|$ is maximum (indices mod m).

Claim 3.1 $f(\xi_i) \geq (|F_i| + |F_{i+1}| + 2)/2$ ($i = 1, \dots, m$).

Proof of Claim 3.1. We distingwish two cases.

Case 1. Either $x_i \in F_i$, $y_i \in F_{i+1}$ or $x_i \in F_{i+1}$, $y_i \in F_i$.

If $x_i \in F_i$, $y_i \in F_{i+1}$, then $f(\xi_i) \geq |\xi_i x_i \overrightarrow{Q} y_i \xi_{i+1}| - 1$ and hence

$$f(\xi_i) \geq \max(|F_i|, |F_{i+1}|) + 1 \geq (|F_i| + |F_{i+1}| + 2)/2.$$

Otherwise, the result holds from $f(\xi_i) \geq |\xi_i y_i \overrightarrow{Q} x_i \xi_{i+1}| - 1$ in the same way.

Case 2. Either $x_i, y_i \in F_i$ or $x_i, y_i \in F_{i+1}$.

First, suppose $x_i, y_i \in F_i$. We can assume also $x_i, y_i \notin F_{i+1}$, since otherwise we could argue as in case 1. Choose $x_i, y_i' \in F_{i+1}$ such that $|x_i \overrightarrow{Q} y_i'|$ is maximum. If $|x_i \overrightarrow{Q} x_i'| - 1 \geq (|F_i| - |F_{i+1}|)/2$, then

$$f(\xi_i) \geq |\xi_i x_i \overrightarrow{Q} y_i' \xi_{i+1}| - 1 \geq (|F_i| - |F_{i+1}|)/2 + |F_{i+1}| + 1 = (|F_i| + |F_{i+1}| + 2)/2.$$

Otherwise,

$$\begin{aligned} f(\xi_i) &\geq |\xi_i y_i \overrightarrow{Q} x_i' \xi_{i+1}| - 1 = |x_i' \overrightarrow{Q} y_i| + 1 = |x_i \overrightarrow{Q} y_i| - |x_i \overrightarrow{Q} x_i'| + 2 \geq \\ &\geq |F_i| - (|F_i| - |F_{i+1}| + 1)/2 + 2 > (|F_i| + |F_{i+1}| + 2)/2. \end{aligned}$$

By symmetry, the case $x_i, y_i \in F_{i+1}$ requires the same arguments. Δ

By claim 3.1,

$$\sum_{i=1}^m f(\xi_i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^m (|F_i| + |F_{i+1}| + 2)/2 = \sum_{i=1}^m |F_i| + m,$$

which by (1) gives the desired result. Finally, if $v_i \neq w_i$ for some $i \in \{0, \dots, q\}$, then we can argue exactly as in case $v_i = w_i$ ($i = 0, \dots, q$). Δ

Proof of lemma 4. (d1). Case1. $u \in U_1$.

Let $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_f$ be the elements of Λ_u occuring on H in a consecutive order with $u = \xi_1$. For each integer i ($1 \leq i \leq f$), let

$$M_i = \xi_i \overrightarrow{H} \xi_{i+1}, \quad \omega_i = |A_u(\xi_i)| + |A_u(\xi_{i+1})| \quad (\text{indices mod } f).$$

Since H is extreme,

$$|M_i| \geq |\Lambda_u(\xi_i, \xi_{i+1})| \quad (i = 1, \dots, f). \quad (2)$$

Let $\xi_r \overrightarrow{H} \xi_s$ be the longest segment on H such that

$$\xi_1 \in V(\xi_r \overrightarrow{H} \xi_s), \quad \{\xi_r, \xi_{r+1}, \dots, \xi_s\} \subseteq B_u \cup \{u\}.$$

Put

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^+ &= \{M_i \in \{M_2, \dots, M_{f-1}\} \mid \overline{\rho}_u(\xi_i) \neq \overline{\rho}_u(\xi_{i+1})\}, \\ \Omega^- &= \{M_i \in \{M_1, M_f\} \mid \overline{\rho}_u(\xi_i) \neq \overline{\rho}_u(\xi_{i+1})\}, \\ \Omega^0 &= \{M_1, \dots, M_f\} \setminus (\Omega^+ \cup \Omega^-). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $|\Omega^-| \leq 2$ and $|M_i| - 1 \geq |\Lambda_u(\xi_i, \xi_{i+1})| - 1$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, f\}$. Then clearly

$$\text{if } M_i \in \Omega^+, \text{ then } |M_i| - 1 \geq \omega_i + |A_u(u)| - 1, \quad (3)$$

$$\text{if } M_i \in \Omega^-, \text{ then } |M_i| - 1 \geq \omega_i - |A_u(u)| + 1, \quad (4)$$

$$M_i \in \Omega^0 \implies |M_i| - 1 \geq \omega_i. \quad (5)$$

Claim 4.1. If $|\Omega^-| = 0$ then $|M_i| - 1 \geq \omega_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, f$).

Proof of Claim 4.1. Immediate from (3), (4) and (5). Δ

Claim 4.2.

(k1) If $|\Omega^-| = 1$, say $\Omega^- = \{M_1\}$, then $M_s \in \Omega^+$.

(k2) If $\Omega^- = \{M_1\}$ and $\Omega^+ = \{M_s\}$, then

$$B_u \cup \{u\} \subseteq V(\xi_r \vec{H} \xi_s), \quad \Lambda_u \setminus (B_u \cup \{u\}) \subseteq V(\xi_{s+1} \vec{H} \xi_{r-1}).$$

Proof of Claim 4.2. (k1) Let $\Omega^- = \{M_1\}$. By the definition, $\{\xi_2, \dots, \xi_s\} \subseteq B_u$ and $\xi_{s+1} \in \Lambda_u \setminus (B_u \cup \{u\})$, implying that $M_s \in \Omega^+$. Δ

(k2) It follows that $\{\xi_{s+1}, \dots, \xi_f\} \subseteq \Lambda_u \setminus (B_u \cup \{u\})$. On the other hand (by the definition), $\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_s\} \subseteq B_u \cup \{u\}$ and the proof is complete. Δ

Claim 4.3. (11) If $|\Omega^-| = 2$, i.e. $\Omega^- = \{M_1, M_f\}$, then $M_s, M_{r-1} \in \Omega^+$.

(12) If $\Omega^- = \{M_1, M_f\}$ and $\Omega^+ = \{M_s, M_{r-1}\}$, then ξ_1, ξ_r, ξ_s are pairwise different and

$$B_u \cup \{u\} \subseteq V(\xi_r \vec{H} \xi_s), \quad \Lambda_u \setminus (B_u \cup \{u\}) \subseteq V(\xi_{s+1} \vec{H} \xi_{r-1}).$$

Proof of claim 4.3. (11) By the definition, $\{\xi_2, \xi_f, \xi_s, \xi_r\} \subseteq B_u$ and $\xi_{s+1}, \xi_{r-1} \in \Lambda_u \setminus (B_u \cup \{u\})$, which implies $M_s, M_{r-1} \in \Omega^+$. Δ

(12) It follows that $\{M_{s+1}, \dots, M_{r-2}\} \cap \Omega^+ = \emptyset$ and hence

$$\{\xi_{s+1}, \dots, \xi_{r-1}\} \subseteq \Lambda_u \setminus (B_u \cup \{u\}).$$

On the other hand (by the definition) $\{\xi_r, \dots, \xi_s\} \subseteq B_u \cup \{u\}$, which completes the proof of claim 4.3. Δ

The following three statements can be proved easily basing on (3), (4), (5) and claims 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3.

Claim 4.4. $\sum_{i=1}^f (|M_i| - 1) \geq \sum_{i=1}^f \omega_i$.

Claim 4.5. If $t \in \{1, \dots, f\}$, then $\sum_{i \neq t} (|M_i| - 1) \geq \sum_{i \neq t} \omega_i - |A_u(u)| + 1$.

Claim 4.6. If $g, t \in \{1, \dots, f\}$ ($g \neq t$), then $\sum_{i \notin \{g, t\}} (|M_i| - 1) \geq \sum_{i \notin \{g, t\}} \omega_i - 2|A_u(u)| + 2$.

Using (b2) and claim 4.4, we get

$$\begin{aligned} h &= \sum_{i=1}^f (|M_i| - 1) \geq \sum_{i=1}^f \omega_i = \sum_{i=1}^f (|A_u(\xi_i)| + |A_u(\xi_{i+1})|) \\ &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| = 2|\Phi_u \cup B_u|. \end{aligned}$$

By (b1), $|\Phi_u \cup B_u| = \varphi_u + b_u = \gamma_u$, implying that $h \geq 2\gamma_u$.

Case 2. $u \in U_2$.

Let $\Theta(\overrightarrow{T}(u), V_{neut}, V_{fin}) = (P_0, \dots, P_\pi)$, where $P_i = y_i \overrightarrow{P_i} z_i$ ($i = 0, \dots, \pi$). By (a2), there is an (u, z_π) -path L of length at least $\varphi_u + 1$ with $V(L) \subseteq V(T(u)) \cup V^*$. Let $z_\pi \in V(T(w))$ for some $w \in V(H)$. By denoting $B_u \cup \{u, w\} = \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_f\}$, we can argue exactly as in case 1.

Case 3. $u \in U_*$.

Clearly $h \geq 2(b_u + 1) = 2(\varphi'_u + b_u + 1) > 2\gamma_u$. Δ

(d2) Since $|T(u)| - 1 = 1$, we have $u \in U_1 \cup U_*$. If $u \in U_*$, then $b_u = 0$ and $h \geq 2 = 2(\varphi'_u + b_u + 1) = 2(\gamma_u + 1) \geq \gamma_u + 1$. Let $u \in U_1$. Define

$$\xi_i, \omega_i, M_i, \xi_r, \overrightarrow{H}\xi_s, \Omega^+, \Omega^-, \Omega^0 \quad (6)$$

as in proof of (d1). It is easy to see that $\Omega^+ = \Omega^- = \emptyset$. By claim 4.1, $\sum_{i=1}^f (|M_i| - 1) \geq \sum_{i=1}^f \omega_i$ and as in proof of (d1), $h \geq 2|\Phi_u \cup B_u| = 2\varphi_u$. Noting that $\varphi_u \geq b_u + |\{u\}| = b_u + 1$, we obtain $h \geq \varphi_u + b_u + 1 = \gamma_u + 1$. Δ

(d3) It is easily checked that $h \geq \gamma_u + 1$ if $u \in U_0$. If $u \in \overline{U}_0$, then by (d1) and (d2), $h \geq \min(2\gamma_u, \gamma_u + 1) \geq \gamma_u + 1$. Δ

Proof of lemma 5. Assume w.l.o.g. that $x, y \in \Lambda_u$.

(e1) **Case 1** $u \in U_1$.

Following (6) we let, in addition, $y\overrightarrow{H}x = M_t$ for some t ($1 \leq t \leq f$). By claim 4.5 we can distinguish the following two cases:

Case 1.1. $|x\overrightarrow{H}y| - 1 \geq \sum_{i \neq t} \omega_i$.

By (b1), $|\Phi_u \cup B_u| = |\Phi_u| + |B_u| = \gamma_u$, and using (b2),

$$\begin{aligned} |x\overrightarrow{H}y| - 1 &\geq \sum_{i \neq t} \omega_i = \sum_{i=1}^f \omega_i - \omega_t \\ &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| - |A_u(\xi_t)| - |A_u(\xi_{t+1})| \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| + \sum_{i \notin \{t, t+1\}} |A_u(\xi_i)| \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| = |\Phi_u \cup B_u| = \gamma_u. \end{aligned}$$

Case 1.2. $\sum_{i \neq t} \omega_i - |A_u(u)| + 1 \leq |x\overrightarrow{H}y - 1| < \sum_{i \neq t} \omega_i$.

If $\Omega^- = \emptyset$, then by claim 4.1., $|x\overrightarrow{H}y| - 1 \geq \sum_{i \neq t} \omega_i$, a contradiction. Let $\Omega^- \neq \emptyset$.

Case 1.2.1. $|\Omega^-| = 1$.

Assume w.l.o.g. $\Omega^- = \{M_1\}$. By claim 4.2, $M_s \in \Omega^+$. If $|\Omega^+| \geq 2$, then by (3), (4) and (5), $|x\overrightarrow{H}y| - 1 \geq \sum_{i \neq t} \omega_i$, a contradiction. Thus we can assume $\Omega^+ = \{M_s\}$. If $M_t \neq M_s$, then again $|x\overrightarrow{H}y| - 1 \geq \sum_{i \neq t} \omega_i$, a contradiction. Finally, if $M_t = M_s$, then $A_u(\xi_t)$, $A_u(\xi_{t+1})$ and $A_u(u)$ are pairwise different and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
|x\vec{H}y| - 1 &\geq 2 \sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| - |A_u(\xi_t)| - |A_u(\xi_{t+1})| - |A_u(u)| + 1 = \\
&\sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| + \sum_{i \notin \{1, t, t+1\}} |A_u(\xi_i)| + 1 \geq \sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| + (f-3) + 1 \\
&\geq \sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| = |\Phi_u \cup B_u| = \gamma_u.
\end{aligned}$$

Case 1.2.2. $|\Omega^-| = 2$.

By claim 4.3, $M_s, M_{r-1} \in \Omega^+$. If $|\Omega^+| \geq 3$, then by (3), (4) and (5), $|x\vec{H}y| - 1 \geq \sum_{i \neq t} \omega_i$, a contradiction. Let $\Omega^+ = \{M_s, M_{r-1}\}$. If $M_t \notin \Omega^+$, then again $|x\vec{H}y| - 1 \geq \sum_{i \neq t} \omega_i$, a contradiction. Finally, if $M_t \in \Omega^+$, say $M_t = M_s$, then $A_u(\xi_t)$, $A_u(\xi_{t+1})$, $A_u(u)$ are pairwise different and we can argue exactly as in case 1.2.1.

Case 2. $u \in U_2 \cup U_*$.

Apply the arguments used in the proof of (d1) (case 2 and case 3).

(e2) Clearly $u \in U_1$. Following (6) we see that $\Omega^+ = \Omega^- = \emptyset$. By claim 4.1, $|M_i| - 1 \geq \omega_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, f$). Recalling that $f \geq b_u + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|x\vec{H}y| - 1 &= \sum_{i \neq t} (|M_i| - 1) \geq \sum_{i \neq t} \omega_i = \sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| + \sum_{i \notin \{t, t+1\}} |A_u(\xi_i)| \\
&\geq |\Phi_u \cup B_u| + f - 2 = \varphi_u + f - 2 = \varphi_u + b_u - 1 = \gamma_u - 1.
\end{aligned}$$

(e3) It was shown in (e2) that $|x\vec{H}y| - 1 \geq \varphi_u + f - 2 \geq \gamma_u - 1$. Since $|x\vec{H}y| - 1 = \gamma_u - 1$, we have $|x\vec{H}y| - 1 = \varphi_u + f - 2 = \gamma_u - 1$. This implies $|B_u| = b_u = f - 1$ and therefore $B_u = \Lambda_u \setminus \{u\} \subseteq U_0$. But then $\varphi_u = b_u + 1$ and $|x\vec{H}y| - 1 = \gamma_u - 1 = 2\varphi_u - 2$ implying that $(\hat{u}, x\vec{H}y) \in \Delta$. Δ

Proof of lemma 6. (f1) Case 1. $u \in U_1$.

By symmetry, we can assume $v = x_2$. Following (6) we let, in addition, $M_g = y_1 \vec{H} x_2$ and $M_t = y_2 \vec{H} x_1$ for some integers $g, t \in \{1, \dots, f\}$. This means that

$$y_1 = \xi_g, x_2 = \xi_{g+1}, y_2 = \xi_t, x_1 = \xi_{t+1}, v = x_2 = \xi_{g+1}, A_u(\xi_{g+1}) = A_u(v).$$

Putting $\beta = |x_1 \vec{H} y_1| - 1 + |x_2 \vec{H} y_2| - 1$ and using claim 4.6, we can distinguish the following four cases.

Case 1.1. $\beta \geq \sum_{i \notin \{g, t\}} \omega_i + |A_u(u)| - 1$.

Clearly

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta &\geq 2 \sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| - |A_u(\xi_g)| - |A_u(\xi_{g+1})| - |A_u(\xi_t)| - |A_u(\xi_{t+1})| \\
&\quad + |A_u(u)| - 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Observe that $|A_u(u)| \geq 1$ and $f \geq b_u + 1$. If $x_1 \neq y_1$, then $A_u(\xi_g)$, $A_u(\xi_t)$ and $A_u(\xi_{t+1})$ are pairwise different and by (7),

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta + |A_u(v)| &= \beta + |A_u(\xi_{g+1})| \geq \sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| + \sum_{i \notin \{g, t, t+1\}} |A_u(\xi_i)| \\
&\geq \sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| + f - 3 \geq |\Phi_u \cup B_u| + f - 3 \\
&\geq |\Phi_u| + f - 3 \geq \varphi_u + b_u - 2 \geq \gamma_u - 1 - |A_u(u)|.
\end{aligned}$$

Otherwise $(x_1 = y_1)$, $A_u(\xi_{t+1}) = A_u(u)$, and by (7),

$$\begin{aligned} \beta + |A_u(v)| &= \beta + |A_u(\xi_{g+1})| \geq 2 \sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| - |A_u(\xi_g)| - |A_u(\xi_t)| - 1 \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| + \sum_{i \notin \{g,t\}} |A_u(\xi_i)| - 1 \geq |\Phi_u \cup B_u| + f - 3 \\ &\geq \varphi_u + b_u - 2 \geq \gamma_u - 1 - |A_u(u)|. \end{aligned}$$

Case 1.2. $\sum_{i \notin \{g,t\}} \omega_i \leq \beta < \sum_{i \notin \{g,t\}} \omega_i + |A_u(u)| - 1$.

Clearly

$$\begin{aligned} \beta + |A_u(v)| &= \beta + |A_u(\xi_{g+1})| \\ &\geq 2 \sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| - |A_u(\xi_g)| - |A_u(\xi_t)| - |A_u(\xi_{t+1})|. \end{aligned}$$

If $x_1 \neq y_1$, then we obtain the desired result as in case 1.1. Let $x_1 = y_1$, i.e. $M_g = M_1$, $M_t = M_f$ and $\xi_{t+1} = \xi_g = \xi_1 = u$. If $\Omega^+ \neq \emptyset$, then $\beta \geq \sum_{i \notin \{1,t\}} \omega_i + |A_u(u)| - 1$, a contradiction. Let $\Omega^+ = \emptyset$. This implies $M_s = M_1$ and $M_{r-1} = M_f$, and we deduce that

$$B_u \cup \{u\} = \{u\} = V(x_1 \vec{H} y_1), \quad \Lambda_u \setminus \{u\} \subseteq V(x_2 \vec{H} y_2).$$

Recalling that $f \geq b_u + 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \beta + |A_u(u)| + |A_u(v)| &= \beta + |A_u(u)| + |A_u(\xi_{g+1})| \\ &\geq 2 \sum_{i=1}^t |A_u(\xi_i)| - |A_u(\xi_t)| - |A_u(\xi_{t+1})| \\ &\geq |\Phi_u \cup B_u| + f - 2 \geq \varphi_u + b_u - 1 \geq \gamma_u - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Case 1.3. $\sum_{i \notin \{g,t\}} \omega_i - |A_u(u)| + 1 \leq \beta < \sum_{i \notin \{g,t\}} \omega_i$.

Case 1.3.1. $\xi_1 \notin \{x_1, y_1\}$.

It follows that $A_u(u)$, $A_u(\xi_g)$, $A_u(\xi_t)$ and $A_u(\xi_{t+1})$ are pairwise different. Since $f \geq b_u + 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta + |A_u(v)| &= \beta + |A_u(\xi_{g+1})| \\ &\geq 2 \sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| - |A_u(u)| - |A_u(\xi_g)| - |A_u(\xi_t)| - |A_u(\xi_{t+1})| + 1 \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| + f - 3 \geq \varphi_u + b_u - 2 \geq \gamma_u - 1 - |A_u(u)|. \end{aligned}$$

Case 1.3.2. $\xi_1 \in \{x_1, y_1\}$.

Assume w.l.o.g. that $\xi_1 = x_1$, i.e. $M_t = M_f$. If $M_1 \notin \Omega^-$, then $\beta \geq \sum_{i \notin \{g,t\}} \omega_i$, a contradiction. Let $M_1 \in \Omega^-$. This implies $\xi_2 \in B_u$ and $M_s \in \Omega^+$. If $M_s \neq M_g$, then $\beta \geq \sum_{i \notin \{g,t\}} \omega_i$, a contradiction. So, assume $M_s = M_g$. Analogously, $M_{r-1} = M_f$. If $M_j \in \Omega^+$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, f\} \setminus \{g\}$, then again $\beta \geq \sum_{i \notin \{g,t\}} \omega_i$, a contradiction. Let

$$i \in \{1, \dots, f\} \setminus \{g\} \implies M_i \in \Omega^0 \cup \Omega^-.$$

It follows that $B_u \cup \{u\} \subseteq V(x_1 \vec{H} y_1)$ and $\Lambda_u \setminus (B_u \cup \{u\}) \subseteq V(x_2 \vec{H} y_2)$. Furthermore, noting that $A_u(\xi_g)$, $A_u(\xi_t)$, $A_u(\xi_{t+1})$ are pairwise different and

$f \geq b_u + 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \beta + |A_u(u)| + |A_u(v)| &= \beta + |A_u(u)| + |A_u(\xi_{g+1})| \\ &\geq 2 \sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| - |A_u(\xi_g)| - |A_u(\xi_t)| - |A_u(\xi_{t+1})| + 1 \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| + f - 2 \geq \varphi_u + b_u - 1 \geq \gamma_u - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Case 1.4. $\sum_{i \notin \{g,t\}} \omega_i - 2|A_u(u)| + 2 \leq \beta < \sum_{i \notin \{g,t\}} \omega_i - |A_u(u)| + 1$.

If $|\Omega^-| \leq 1$, then clearly $\beta \geq \sum_{i \notin \{g,t\}} \omega_i - |A_u(u)| + 1$, a contradiction. Let $|\Omega^-| = 2$. This implies $M_1, M_f \in \Omega^-$ and $M_s, M_{r-1} \in \Omega^+$. If $|\Omega^+| \geq 3$, then again $\beta \geq \sum_{i \notin \{g,t\}} \omega_i - |A_u(u)| + 1$, a contradiction. Let $|\Omega^+| = 2$, i.e. $\Omega^+ = \{M_s, M_{r-1}\}$. By claim 4.3,

$$B_u \bigcup \{u\} \subseteq V(x_1 \vec{H} y_1), \quad \Lambda_u \setminus (B_u \bigcup \{u\}) \subseteq V(x_2 \vec{H} y_2).$$

Recalling that $f \geq b_u + 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \beta + |A_u(u)| + |A_u(v)| &= \beta + |A_u(u)| + |A_u(\xi_{g+1})| \\ &\geq 2 \sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| - |A_u(u)| - |A_u(\xi_g)| - |A_u(\xi_t)| - |A_u(\xi_{t+1})| + 2 \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^f |A_u(\xi_i)| + \sum_{i \notin \{1,g,t,t+1\}} |A_u(\xi_i)| + 2 \\ &\geq |\Phi_u \bigcup B_u| + (f - 4) + 2 \geq \gamma_u - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2. $u \in U_2$.

Apply the arguments used in the proof of (d1) (see case 2 and case 3).

(f2) **Case 1.** $u \in U_1$.

As shown in the proof of (f1),

$$\beta + |A_u(u)| + |A_u(v)| \geq |\Phi_u \bigcup B_u| + f - 2 \geq |\Phi_u| + f - 2 \geq \varphi_u + b_u - 1.$$

Since $\beta + |A_u(u)| + |A_u(v)| = \varphi_u + b_u - 1 = \gamma_u - 1$, we have equations

$$\beta + |A_u(u)| + |A_u(v)| = |\Phi_u \bigcup B_u| + f - 2 = |\Phi_u| + f - 2 = \varphi_u + b_u - 1$$

implying that $f = b_u + 1$. If $|T(u)| - 1 \geq 2$, then $\Lambda_u \setminus (B_u \bigcup \{u\}) \neq \emptyset$ and hence $f \geq |B_u| + |\{u\}| + 1 = b_u + 2$, a contradiction. Otherwise ($|T(u)| - 1 = 1$),

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_u &= B_u \bigcup \{u\}, \quad |A_u(u)| = |A_u(v)| = 1, \\ \varphi_u &= b_u + 1, \quad \beta = \varphi_u + b_u - 3 = 2\varphi_u - 4 \end{aligned}$$

and we deduce that $(\hat{u}, x_i \vec{H} y_i) \in \Delta$ ($i = 1, 2$) and $\gamma_u - 1 = 2(\varphi_u - 1)$.

Case 2. $u \in U_2$.

Apply the arguments used in the proof of (d1). Δ

Proof of lemma 7. (g1) Clearly $h \geq 2(b_u + 1) = 2(\varphi'_u + b_u + 1) = 2(\gamma_u + 1)$ and therefore, $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq h/2 \geq \gamma_u + 1$. Δ

(g2) By (d1), $h \geq 2\gamma_u$ which implies $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq h/2 \geq \gamma_u$. Δ

(g3), (g5) If $|\Lambda_u| = 1$, then $\gamma_u = 1$ and there is nothing to prove. Let $|\Lambda_u| \geq 2$, i.e. $u \in U_1$.

Case 1. $u \notin \{x, y\}$.

Assume w.l.o.g. that $u \in V(x^+ \vec{H} y^-)$. We can assume also that $\Lambda_u \not\subseteq V(x \vec{H} y)$, since otherwise the result holds by (e2). Let $x_1 \vec{H} y_1$ be the longest segment in $x \vec{H} y^-$ with $x_1, y_1 \in \Lambda_u$ and $x_2 \vec{H} y_2$ be the longest segment in $y \vec{H} x^-$ with $x_2, y_2 \in \Lambda_u$. Putting $\beta = |x_1 \vec{H} y_1| - 1 + |x_2 \vec{H} y_2| - 1$ we see (by lemma 6) that

$$\beta \geq \gamma_u - 1 - |A_u(u)| - |A_u(y_2)| = \gamma_u - 2 - |A_u(y_2)|$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} |O_u(x, y)| - 1 &\geq |x \vec{H} y_1 \Lambda_u(y_1, y_2) y_2 \vec{H} y| - 1 \\ &\geq \beta + |A_u(y_1)| + |A_u(y_2)| \geq \gamma_u - 2 + |A_u(y_1)| \geq \gamma_u - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2. $u \in \{x, y\}$.

Assume w.l.o.g. that $u = x$. Let $x_1 \vec{H} y_1$ be the longest segment in $x^+ \vec{H} y$ with $x_1, y_1 \in \Lambda_x$ and $x_2 \vec{H} y_2$ be the longest segment in $y^+ \vec{H} x$ with $y_2 \in \Lambda_x$. Putting $\beta = |x_1 \vec{H} y| + |x_2 \vec{H} x| - 2$ we see (by lemma 6) that

$$\beta \geq \gamma_x - 1 - |A_x(x)| - |A_x(x_1)| = \gamma_x - 2 - |A_x(x_1)|,$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} |O_x(x, y)| - 1 &\geq |x \vec{H} x_2 \Lambda_x(x_2, x_1) x_1 \vec{H} y| - 1 \\ &\geq \beta + |A_x(x_1)| + |A_x(x_2)| \geq \gamma_x + |A_x(x_2)| - 2 \geq \gamma_x - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Also, by (e1) and (e2), $|x_1 \vec{H} x| - 1 \geq \gamma_x - 1$, $|x_2 \vec{H} y| - 1 \geq \gamma_x - 1$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} |O(\overset{\circ}{x}, x)| - 1 &\geq |\overset{\circ}{x} \rho_x(x_1) T(x_1) x_1 \vec{H} x| - 1 \geq |x_1 \vec{H} x| \geq \gamma_x, \\ |O(\overset{\circ}{x}, y)| - 1 &\geq |\overset{\circ}{x} \rho_x(x_2) T(x_2) x_2 \vec{H} y| - 1 \geq |x_2 \vec{H} y| \geq \gamma_x. \quad \Delta \end{aligned}$$

(g4) We can suppose $u \notin \{x, y\}$, since otherwise the arguments are the same. Assume w.l.o.g. that $u \in V(x^+ \vec{H} y^-)$. Clearly $|O_u(x, y)| = |O(x, y)|$. In order to prove (g4.1)–(g4.4), we recall (by the hypothesis) that $\Lambda_u \subseteq V(x \vec{H} y)$ and $(\overset{\circ}{u}, H) \notin \Delta$.

(g4.1), (g4.2) By (e2), $\gamma_u - 1 = |O(x, y)| - 1 \geq |x \vec{H} y| - 1 \geq \gamma_u - 1$ which implies $|O(x, y)| - 1 = |x \vec{H} y| - 1 = \gamma_u - 1$. Using (e3), it is easy to see that $(\overset{\circ}{u}, x \vec{H} y) \in \Delta$, $\gamma_u - 1 = 2(\varphi_u - 1)$ and $B_u = \Lambda_u \setminus \{u\} \subseteq U_0$.

(g4.3) **Case 1.** $z \in U_1$.

Case 1.1. $\Lambda_z \not\subseteq V(x \vec{H} y)$.

Choose $w \in \Lambda_z \cap V(y^+ \vec{H} x^-)$. If $z = x^+$, then

$$|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq |y \overleftarrow{H} z \Lambda_z(z, w) w \vec{H} x| - 1 \geq |x \vec{H} y|,$$

a contradiction. Otherwise we reach a contradiction by the following way

$$|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq |y \overleftarrow{H} z^+ \overset{0}{u} x^{++} \vec{H} z \Lambda_z(z, w) w \vec{H} x| - 1 \geq |x \vec{H} y|.$$

Case 1.2. $\Lambda_z \subseteq V(x \vec{H} y)$.

Choose $w \in \Lambda_z \setminus \{z\}$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $w \in V(x \vec{H} z^-)$. Since $z \in U_1$, we have $|\Lambda_z(z, w)| - 1 \geq 2$ and hence

$$|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq |y \overleftarrow{H} z \Lambda_z(z, w) w \vec{H} z^- \overset{0}{u} w' \vec{H} x| - 1 \geq |x \vec{H} y|$$

for some $w' \in \{w^-, w^{--}\}$, a contradiction.

Case 2. $z \in U_0 \cup U_2$.

If $z \in U_2$, then apply the arguments used in the proof of (d1) (see case 2 and 3). Let $z \in U_0$. If there exists a vertex $w \in (\Lambda_z \setminus \{z\}) \setminus \Lambda_u$, then we can reach a contradiction as in case 1. Otherwise, $\Lambda_z \subseteq \Lambda_u \cup \{z\}$ and $\gamma_z \leq \varphi_u = (\gamma_u + 1)/2$.

(g4.4) Suppose, to the contrary, that $\Lambda_z \not\subseteq V(x \vec{H} y)$. If $|y \vec{H} x| - 1 = 2$, then clearly $(\overset{0}{u}, H) \in \Delta$, a contradiction. Let $|y \vec{H} x| - 1 \geq 3$. Choose $w \in \Lambda_z \cap V(y^+ \vec{H} x^-)$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $|w \vec{H} x| - 1 \geq 2$. If $z \notin \Lambda_u$, then by (g4.3), we are done. Otherwise,

$$|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq |y \overleftarrow{H} z^{++} \overset{0}{u} x^{++} \vec{H} z \Lambda_z(z, w) w \vec{H} x| - 1 \geq |x \vec{H} y|,$$

a contradiction. So, (g4.1) – (g4.4) are proved. A similar proof holds for (g4.5) – (g4.7) when $\Lambda_u \not\subseteq V(x \vec{H} y)$ and $\Lambda_u \not\subseteq V(y \vec{H} x)$. So, the proof of (g4) is completed. Δ

(g6), (g7) Let $u = x^+$. Choose $v \in \Lambda_u$ so as to maximize $|v \vec{H} y|$. Clearly, $v \in V(y \vec{H} u)$.

Case 1. $v = u$.

Case 1.1 $|T(u)| - 1 \geq 1$.

By (e1) and (e2), $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq |u \vec{H} y| \geq \gamma_u$. If $|O(x, y)| - 1 = \gamma_u$, then by (e1), $|T(u)| - 1 \leq 1$ and $|u \vec{H} y| = \gamma_u - 1$ which by (e3) holds $(\hat{u}, u \vec{H} y) \in \Delta$.

Case 1.2 $|T(u)| - 1 = 0$.

Clearly, $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq |x \vec{H} y| - 1 \geq \gamma_u$. If $|O(x, y)| - 1 = \gamma_u$, then $|x \vec{H} y| - 1 = \gamma_u$ implying that $uw \in E$ for each $w \in V(x \vec{H} y) \setminus \{u\}$, i.e. $(u, x \vec{H} y) \in \Delta$.

Case 2. $v \neq u$.

Case 2.1 $|T(u)| - 1 \geq 1$.

By (e1) and (e2), $|v \vec{H} y| - 1 \geq \gamma_u - 1$ and hence

$$|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq |y \overleftarrow{H} u \Lambda_u(u, v) v \vec{H} x| - 1 \geq |v \vec{H} y| - 1 + |T(u)| - 1 \geq \gamma_u + |T(u)| - 2.$$

If $|O(x, y)| - 1 = \gamma_u$, then $|T(u)| - 1 = 1$, $|v\vec{H}y| - 1 = \gamma_u - 1$ and by (e3), $(\hat{u}, v\vec{H}y) \in \Delta$.

Case 2.2 $|T(u)| - 1 = 0$.

Clearly, $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq |y\vec{H}u\Lambda_u(u, v)v\vec{H}x| - 1 \geq |v\vec{H}y| - 1 \geq \gamma_u$. If $|O(x, y)| - 1 = \gamma_u$, then $|v\vec{H}y| - 1 = \gamma_u$ implying that $uw \in E$ for each $w \in V(v\vec{H}y) \setminus \{u\}$, i.e. $(u, v\vec{H}y) \in \Delta$. Δ

(g8) By (g4), $(\overset{o}{x}, H) \in \Delta$. Since $\{w, y\} \subseteq \Lambda_x$, we have $h \geq 6$. If $|O_x(x, y)| - 1 \leq \gamma_z$, then by (g4.6) and (g4.7), $h - 2 = |O_x(x, y)| - 1 \leq \gamma_z \leq h/2$ implying that $h \leq 4$, a contradiction. So, $|O_x(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_z + 1$. By symmetry, $|O_x(x, w)| - 1 \geq \gamma_z + 1$ and the result follows. Δ

Proof of lemma 8. Immediate from definition 3.11. Δ

Proof of lemma 9. By (d3), $h \geq \gamma_i + 1$ and $h \geq \gamma_{i+1} + 1$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$. In other words,

$$h - 1 \geq (\gamma_i + \gamma_{i+1})/2 \quad (i = 1, \dots, h). \quad (8)$$

(i1) By lemma 8, it suffices to prove $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq \beta_i$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $i = 1$ and $u_1, u_2 \in V(x^+\vec{H}y^-)$.

Case 1. $u_1, u_2 \in U_0$.

Putting $\Gamma_i = \Phi_i \cap V(H)$ ($i = 1, 2$) we see that $|\Gamma_i| = \varphi_i - b_i^* = \gamma_i$ ($i = 1, 2$).

Case 1.1. $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \subseteq V(x\vec{H}y)$.

Clearly $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq |x\vec{H}y| - 1 \geq \max(|\Gamma_1|, |\Gamma_2|) \geq (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)/2$.

Case 1.2. $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \not\subseteq V(x\vec{H}y)$.

Assume w.l.o.g. that $\Gamma_1 \cap (V(y^+\vec{H}x^-)) \neq \emptyset$. Let $z_1\vec{H}z_2$ be the longest segment in $y^+\vec{H}x^-$ with $z_1, z_2 \in \Gamma_1$.

Case 1.2.1. $\Gamma_2 \cap V(y^+\vec{H}x^-) = \emptyset$.

Choose $w \in V(x^+\vec{H}u_1)$ such that $u_2w \in E$ and $|x\vec{H}w|$ is minimum. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |O(x, y)| - 1 &\geq |x\vec{H}y| - 1 \geq |w\vec{H}y| + |x\vec{H}w| - 2 \geq \gamma_2 + |x\vec{H}w| - 2, \\ |O(x, y)| - 1 &\geq |x\vec{H}z_1u_1\vec{H}wu_2\vec{H}y| - 1 \geq \gamma_1 - |x\vec{H}w| + 2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these two inequalities yields $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)/2$.

Case 1.2.2. $\Gamma_2 \cap V(y^+\vec{H}x^-) \neq \emptyset$.

Let $w_1\vec{H}w_2$ be the longest segment in $y^+\vec{H}x^-$ with $w_1, w_2 \in \Gamma_2$.

Case 1.2.2.1. $z_1, w_2 \in V(w_1\vec{H}z_2)$.

It follows that $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq |x\vec{H}u_1z_2\vec{H}w_1u_2\vec{H}y| - 1 \geq \max(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \geq (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)/2$.

Case 1.2.2.2. $z_2, w_1 \in V(z_1\vec{H}w_2)$.

Clearly

$$|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq |x\vec{H}u_1z_1\vec{H}w_2u_2\vec{H}y| - 1 \geq \max(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \geq (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)/2.$$

Case 1.2.2.3. Either $w_1, w_2 \in V(z_1\vec{H}z_2)$ or $z_1, z_2 \in V(w_1\vec{H}w_2)$.

Assume w.l.o.g. that $w_1, w_2 \in V(z_1 \vec{H} z_2)$. If $w_1 = z_1$ (resp. $w_2 = z_2$), then we can argue as in case 1.2.2.1. (resp. 1.2.2.2.). Otherwise ($w_1 \neq z_1$ and $w_2 \neq z_2$),

$$\begin{aligned} |O(x, y)| - 1 &\geq |x \vec{H} u_1 z_1 \vec{H} w_2 u_2 \vec{H} y| - 1 \geq \gamma_2 + |z_1 \vec{H} w_1| - 1, \\ |O(x, y)| - 1 &\geq |x \vec{H} u_1 z_2 \vec{H} w_1 u_2 \vec{H} y| - 1 \geq \gamma_1 - |z_1 \vec{H} w_1| + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these two inequalities yields $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) / 2$.

Case 2. $u_1, u_2 \in \overline{U}_0$.

By (g2) and (g3), $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_i - 1$ ($i = 1, 2$). If either $u_1 \in U_*$ or $u_2 \in U_*$, then by (g1) we are done. Let $u_1, u_2 \in U_1 \cup U_2$.

Case 2.1. Either $|O(x, y)| - 1 = \gamma_1 - 1$ or $|O(x, y)| - 1 = \gamma_2 - 1$.

Assume w.l.o.g. that $|O(x, y)| - 1 = \gamma_1 - 1$. Using (g2) we see that $|T(u)| - 1 = 1$ and by (g4.1) and (g4.3), $u_2 \in U_0 \cup U_*$, a contradiction.

Case 2.2. $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_1$ and $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_2$.

Clearly, $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq \max(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \geq (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) / 2$.

Case 3. $u_1 \in U_0$, $u_2 \in \overline{U}_0$.

By (g2) and (g3),

$$|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_2 - 1. \quad (9)$$

Case 3.1. $\Phi_1 \setminus B_1^* \subseteq V(x \vec{H} y)$.

Clearly $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq |x \vec{H} y| - 1 \geq \gamma_1$. The result is immediate if either $|O(x, y)| - 1 > \gamma_1$ or $|O(x, y)| - 1 > \gamma_2 - 1$. Thus we can assume $|O(x, y)| - 1 = |x \vec{H} y| - 1 = \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 - 1$. Since $|x \vec{H} y| - 1 = \gamma_1$, we have $\Lambda_1 = V(x \vec{H} y) \setminus \{u_1\}$. On the other hand, by (g4.3), $\Lambda_1 \subseteq \Lambda_2 \cup \{u_1\}$, a contradiction.

Case 3.2. $\Phi_1 \setminus B_1^* \not\subseteq V(x \vec{H} y)$.

Let $z_1 \vec{H} z_2$ be the maximal segment in $y^+ \vec{H} x^-$ with $z_1, z_2 \in N(u_1)$.

Case 3.2.1. $\Lambda_2 \subseteq V(x \vec{H} y)$.

For each $v \in \Lambda_2 \cap V(x \vec{H} u_2)$, put $P_v = x \vec{H} z_1 u_1 \vec{H} y$ if $v = u_2$ and

$$P_v = x \vec{H} z_1 u_1 \vec{H} v \Lambda_2(v, u_2) u_2 \vec{H} y$$

if $v \neq u_2$. Choose $w_1 \in \Lambda_2 \cap V(x \vec{H} u_2)$ so as to maximize $|w_1 \vec{H} u_2|$. By (g2) and (g3), $|w_1 \vec{H} y| - 1 \geq \gamma_2 - 1$. If $w_1 \neq x$, then clearly $|z_1 \vec{H} y| - 1 \geq \gamma_1$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} |O(x, y)| - 1 &\geq |P_{w_1}| - 1 \geq |z_1 \vec{H} y| - |x \vec{H} w_1| + 2 \geq \gamma_1 - |x \vec{H} w_1| + 3, \\ |O(x, y)| - 1 &\geq |x \vec{H} y| - 1 \geq |w_1 \vec{H} y| + |x \vec{H} w_1| - 2 \geq \gamma_2 + |x \vec{H} w_1| - 2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these two inequalities yields the results. Now let $w_1 = x$. Choose $w_2 \in \Lambda_2 \cap V(x^+ \vec{H} u_2)$ so as to maximize $|w_2 \vec{H} u_2|$. Since H is extreme,

$$h \geq |u_2 \Lambda_2(u_2, x) x \vec{H} u_1 z_2 \vec{H} u_2| - 1$$

which implies that

$$\overline{p}_2(x) = \hat{u}_2 \implies |z_2 \vec{H} x| - 1 \geq |A_2(x)| + |A_2(u_2)|, \quad (10)$$

$$\bar{p}_2(x) = \overset{o}{u}_2 \implies |z_2 \vec{H}x| - 1 \geq |A_2(x)| + 1 \geq 2. \quad (11)$$

Observe also, that

$$|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq |x \vec{H}y| - 1 \geq \gamma_1 - |z_1 \vec{H}z_2|. \quad (12)$$

Claim 9.1. $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_2 + |z_1 \vec{H}z_2|$.

Proof of claim 9.1. Clearly,

$$|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq |P_{w_2}| - 1 \geq |w_2 \vec{H}y| + |z_2 \vec{H}x| + |z_1 \vec{H}z_2| - 1. \quad (13)$$

By (f1), $|w_2 \vec{H}y| - 1 \geq \gamma_2 - 2 - |A_2(x)|$ if $\bar{p}_2(x) = \overset{o}{u}_2$ and $|w_2 \vec{H}y| - 1 \geq \gamma_2 - 1 - |A_2(u_2)| - |A_2(x)|$ if $\bar{p}_2(x) = \hat{u}_2$. Using also (10) and (11), we obtain $|w_2 \vec{H}y| + |z_2 \vec{H}x| - 2 \geq \gamma_2 - 1$, which by (13) implies $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_2 + |z_1 \vec{H}z_2|$. Δ

Claim 9.1 with together (12) implies the result.

Case 3.2.2. $\Lambda_2 \not\subseteq V(x \vec{H}y)$.

Let $y_1 \vec{H}y_2$ be the maximal segment in $y^+ \vec{H}z^-$ with $y_1, y_2 \in \Lambda_2$.

Case 3.2.2.1. Either $z_1, y_2 \in V(y_1 \vec{H}z_2)$ or $z_2, y_1 \in V(z_1 \vec{H}y_2)$.

Assume w.l.o.g that $z_1, y_2 \in V(y_1 \vec{H}z_2)$. Then

$$|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq |y \vec{H}u_2 \Lambda_2(u_2, y_1) y_1 \vec{H}z_2 u_1 \vec{H}x| - 1 \geq \gamma_1 + 1,$$

and the result follows by (9).

Case 3.2.2.2. $z_1, z_2 \in V(y_1 \vec{H}y_2)$.

Apply the arguments in case 3.2.2.1.

Case 3.2.2.3. $y_1, y_2 \in V(z_1 \vec{H}z_2)$.

Putting $\beta = |x \vec{H}y| + |y_1 \vec{H}y_2| - 2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 &= y \vec{H}u_2 \Lambda_2(u_2, y_2) y_2 \vec{H}z_1 u_1 \vec{H}x, \\ P_2 &= y \vec{H}u_2 \Lambda_2(u_2, y_1) y_1 \vec{H}z_2 u_1 \vec{H}x, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq |P_2| - 1 \geq |x \vec{H}y| + |y_1 \vec{H}z_2| \geq \gamma_1 - |z_1 \vec{H}y_1| + 2. \quad (14)$$

Claim 9.2. $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_2 + |z_1 \vec{H}y_1| - 1$.

Proof of claim 9.2. If $\bar{p}_2(y_2) = \hat{u}_2$, then by (f1), $\beta \geq \gamma_2 - 1 - |A_2(u_2)| - |A_2(y_2)|$ and

$$\begin{aligned} |O(x, y)| - 1 &\geq |P_1| - 1 \geq \beta + |A_2(u_2)| + |A_2(y_2)| + |z_1 \vec{H}y_1| - 1 \\ &\geq \gamma_2 + |z_1 \vec{H}y_1| - 2. \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise $(\bar{p}_2(y_2) = \overset{o}{u}_2)$, $\beta \geq \gamma_2 - 2 - |A_2(y_2)| = \gamma_2 - 3$ and

$$|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq |P_1| - 1 \geq \beta + |z_1 \vec{H}y_1| + 1 \geq \gamma_2 + |z_1 \vec{H}y_1| - 2. \quad \Delta$$

Claim 9.2 together with (14) implies the result. Δ

(i2) By (d1), $h \geq 2\gamma_x$ implying that $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq h/2 \geq \gamma_x$. Also, $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_z$ by (g6). Using lemma 8, $|\Omega(x, y)| - 1 \geq |O(x, y)| - 1 \geq (\gamma_x + \gamma_z)/2$. Δ

(i3) By (g1), $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_x + 1$ and by (g6), $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_z$. Using lemma 8, we obtain the result immediately. Δ

(i4) **Claim 9.3.** $\max(|O_x(x, y)| - 1, |O_x(x, w)| - 1) \geq (\gamma_x + \gamma_z)/2$.

Proof of claim 9.3. By (g6), $\min(|O(x, y)| - 1, |O(x, w)| - 1) \geq \gamma_z$. If either $|O_x(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_x$ or $|O_x(x, w)| - 1 \geq \gamma_x$, then clearly we are done. Otherwise, by (g3), $|O_x(x, y)| - 1 = |O_x(x, w)| - 1 = \gamma_x - 1$ and the result holds by (g8) and lemma 8. Δ

Claim 9.4. $\min(|O(\overset{o}{x}, y)| - 1, |O(\overset{o}{x}, w)| - 1) \geq (\gamma_x + \gamma_z + 1)/2$.

Proof of claim 9.4. By (g5) and (g6), $|O(\overset{o}{x}, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_x$ and $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_z$, respectively. Since $V(O(x, y)) \cap \{\overset{o}{x}\} = \emptyset$ (by definition 2.10), $|O(\overset{o}{x}, y)| - 1 \geq |O(x, y)| \geq \gamma_z + 1$, implying that $|O(\overset{o}{x}, y)| - 1 \geq (\gamma_x + \gamma_z + 1)/2$. Analogously, $|O(\overset{o}{x}, w)| - 1 \geq (\gamma_x + \gamma_z + 1)/2$. Δ

Claim 9.5. $|O(\overset{o}{x}, x)| - 1 \geq (\gamma_x + \gamma_z + 1)/2$.

Proof of claim 9.5. Let $v \in \Lambda_x \setminus \{\overset{o}{x}\}$. By (g5) and (g6), $|O(\overset{o}{x}, x)| - 1 \geq \gamma_x$ and $|O(x, v)| - 1 \geq \gamma_z$, respectively. Hence

$$|O(\overset{o}{x}, x)| - 1 \geq |O(x, v)| + |vT(v)\hat{v}\overset{o}{x}| - 2 \geq \gamma_z + 1$$

which implies $|O(\overset{o}{x}, x)| - 1 \geq (\gamma_x + \gamma_z + 1)/2$. Δ

The result holds from claims 9.3-9.5 and lemma 8. Δ

(i5) By (g6), $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_z$ and $|O(z, w)| - 1 \geq \gamma_x$ and the result follows from lemma 8. Δ

(i6) By (g6), $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq \max(\gamma_{x^+}, \gamma_{x^-})$. If $|T(x)| - 1 \geq 2$, then by (g2), $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_x$ and the result holds immediately. Thus we can assume $|T(x)| - 1 = 1$. Put $z = x^+$ and $w = x^-$. By (g3) and (g6), $|O_x(x, y)| - 1 \geq \max(\gamma_x - 1, \gamma_z, \gamma_w)$. If $|O_x(x, y)| - 1 \geq \min(\gamma_x, \gamma_z + 1, \gamma_w + 1)$, then clearly we are done. Now let $|O_x(x, y)| - 1 = \gamma_x - 1 = \gamma_z = \gamma_w$. Since $u \notin U_*$ (by (g1)), we have by (g4.3) and (g4.7), $\gamma_z \leq (\gamma_x + 1)/2 = (\gamma_z + 2)/2$ implying that $\gamma_z \leq 2$ and $|O_x(x, y)| - 1 \leq 2$. It means that $h \leq 4$. Recalling also (g4.1) and (g4.5), we conclude that $h = 4$, a contradiction. Δ

(i7) If either $|O_x(x, y)| - 1 = \gamma_x - 1$ or $|O_y(x, y)| - 1 = \gamma_y - 1$, say $|O_x(x, y)| - 1 = \gamma_x - 1$, then by (g1)-(g3), $|T(x)| - 1 = 1$. By (g4), either

$(\overset{o}{x}, x\vec{H}y) \in \Delta$ or $(\overset{o}{x}, y\vec{H}x) \in \Delta$ or $(\overset{o}{x}, H) \in \Delta$. This implies by (g4.2) and (g4.6) that $y \in U_0$, a contradiction. Thus $|O_x(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_x$ and $|O_y(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_y$. Using (g6) with lemma 8, we obtain $|\Omega(x, y)| - 1 \geq (\gamma_x + \gamma_z)/2$ for each $z \in \{x^+, x^-\}$ and $|\Omega(x, y)| - 1 \geq (\gamma_y + \gamma_w)/2$ for each $w \in \{y^+, y^-\}$. Then the result follows from (i1). Δ

(i8) Observing that $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq |y\vec{H}x| - 1 = h - 1$, we obtain the result from (8) immediately. Δ

(i9) Put $z = x^+$. We can assume $h \geq 4$, since otherwise the result holds from (i8). By (d3), $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq h - 2 \geq \gamma_x - 1$. If $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq \gamma_z + 1$, then clearly we are done. Let $|O(x, y)| - 1 = \gamma_z$. By (g7), $|T(z)| - 1 \leq 1$. If $\Lambda_z \cap V(y^+\vec{H}x^-) \neq \emptyset$, then by (g7), $\hat{z} x^- \in E$. Hence $|O(x, y)| - 1 \geq h - 1$ and by (8) we are done. Now let $\Lambda_z \subseteq V(x\vec{H}y)$. It means that $\gamma_z = 2$ and $|O(x, y)| - 1 = 2$. But then $h = 4$, a contradiction. Δ

Proof of the theorem. Let G be a graph, C be a longest cycle in G and $H = u_1 \dots u_h u_1$ a longest cycle in $G \setminus C$ with a maximal HC -extension T . Putting $U_* = \{v_1^*, \dots, v_r^*\}$ and using definition 3.3, we let for each $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$,

$$\Theta(\overleftarrow{T}(v_i^*), V_{neut}, V_{fin}^{(i)}) = (P_0^{(i)}, \dots, P_{\pi(i)}^{(i)}),$$

$$R_i = \langle (V(\overset{\wedge}{v_i^*} \overleftarrow{T}(v_i^*) z_{\pi(i)}^{(i)}) \cup \bigcup_{j=0}^{\pi(i)} V(P_j^{(i)})) \setminus \{z_{\pi(i)}^{(i)}\} \rangle,$$

where $V_{neut} = V \setminus (V(C) \cup V(T))$ and $V_{fin}^{(i)} = V(T) \setminus V(T(v_i^*))$. Since $c \geq \delta + 1 \geq \kappa + 1$, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ there are $\kappa - 1$ internally disjoint paths $E_i^{(1)}, \dots, E_i^{(\kappa-1)}$ in $(\kappa - 1)$ -connected graph $G \setminus \{z_{\pi(i)}^{(i)}\}$, starting at R_i , passing through V_{neut} and terminating on C at $\kappa - 1$ different vertices. Let $E_j^{(a)}$ has a vertex v in common with $E_e^{(b)}$ for some $a, b \in \{1, \dots, \kappa - 1\}$ and $j, e \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ ($j \neq e$). If $v \notin V(C)$, then there is a path starting in R_j , passing through V_{neut} and terminating in R_e , contradicting the fact that $v_j^*, v_e^* \in U_*$. So, $v \in V(C)$. Choose vertex-disjoint paths $E_1^{(i_1)}, \dots, E_t^{(i_t)}$ ($i_j \in \{1, \dots, \kappa - 1\}$) for each $j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ so as to maximize t and put $E_j^{(i_j)} = x_j \vec{E}_j^{(i_j)} w_j^*$ ($j = 1, \dots, t$), where $x_j \in V(R_j)$ and $w_j^* \in V(C)$. It is easy to see that $t \geq \min(r, \kappa - 1)$. By (a2), for each $j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ there is an (x_j, v_j^*) -path $F_j^{(i_j)}$ passing through $V(R_j) \cup V(T(v_j^*))$ and having length at least $\varphi_{v_j^*}$. Denoting

$$E_j^* = v_j^* F_j^{(i_j)} x_j E_j^{(i_j)} w_j^* \quad (j = 1, \dots, t),$$

we see that $E_1^*, \dots, E_t^*$ are vertex disjoint (H, C) -paths with $|E_i^*| - 1 \geq \varphi_{v_i^*} + 1$ ($i = 1, \dots, t$).

Case 1. $\kappa \geq 4, h \geq 5$.

Case 1.1. $r \geq \kappa$.

It follows that $t \geq \kappa - 1$. Let $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_t$ be the elements of $\{w_1^*, \dots, w_t^*\}$ occurring on C in a consecutive order.

Case 1.1.1. $t \geq \kappa$.

Assume w.l.o.g. that $\varphi_{v_1^*} \geq \dots \geq \varphi_{v_r^*}$. Since $r \geq \kappa$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\kappa} \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} \varphi_{v_i^*} \geq \frac{1}{r} \sum_{i=1}^r \varphi_{v_i^*}$$

implying that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} \varphi_{v_i^*} \geq \frac{\kappa}{r} \sum_{i=1}^r \varphi_{v_i^*} \geq \frac{\kappa}{h} \sum_{i=1}^r \varphi_{v_i^*}. \quad (15)$$

By (i1) and (i3), $|\Omega(v_a^*, v_b^*)| - 1 \geq \beta_i$ for each $a, b \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$. Hence

$$|\Omega(v_a^*, v_b^*)| - 1 \geq \frac{1}{h} \sum_{i=1}^h \beta_i = \mu(T).$$

Then for each $i, j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$,

$$|w_i^* \vec{C} w_j^*| - 1 \geq |E_i^*| - 1 + |E_j^*| - 1 + |\Omega(v_i^*, v_j^*)| - 1 \geq \varphi_{v_i^*} + \varphi_{v_j^*} + 2 + \mu(T). \quad (16)$$

Using (15), (16) and recalling that $t \geq \kappa$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} c &= \sum_{i=1}^t (|\xi_i \vec{C} \xi_{i+1}| - 1) \geq 2 \sum_{i=1}^t \varphi_{v_i^*} + 2t + t\mu(T) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^t \varphi_{v_i^*} + 2t + t\mu(T) \geq \frac{\kappa}{h} \sum_{i=1}^r \varphi_{v_i^*} + \kappa\mu(T) + 2\kappa \\ &\geq \frac{\kappa}{h} (\sum_{i=1}^r \varphi_{v_i^*} + \sum_{i=1}^h \varphi_i' + 2h) = \frac{\kappa}{h} (\sum_{i=1}^h \varphi_i + 2h), \end{aligned}$$

where $\xi_{t+1} = \xi_1$. It follows that $\sum_{i=1}^h \varphi_i \leq h(c/\kappa - 2)$. Since $\varphi_i + \psi_i = d(u_i) \geq \delta$ ($i = 1, \dots, h$), we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^h \psi_i \geq h\delta - \sum_{i=1}^h \varphi_i \geq h\delta - ch/\kappa + 2h.$$

In particular, $\max_i \psi_i \geq \delta - c/\kappa + 2$. Using lemma 3, we obtain

$$c \geq \sum_{i=1}^h \psi_i + \max_i \psi_i \geq h\delta - ch/\kappa + 2h + \delta - c/\kappa + 2,$$

and the result follows immediately.

Case 1.1.2. $t = \kappa - 1$.

Observe that $E_{\kappa}^{(i)}$ terminates in $\{w_1^*, \dots, w_{\kappa-1}^*\}$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \kappa - 1\}$, since otherwise $E_1^*, \dots, E_{\kappa-1}^*, E_{\kappa}^{(j)}$ contradict the maximality of t for some $j \in \{1, \dots, \kappa - 1\}$. By the same arguments, $E_j^{(i)}$ terminates in $\{w_1^*, \dots, w_{\kappa-1}^*\}$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \kappa - 1\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, \kappa\}$. Then there is a path $E = vE_{\xi_{t+1}}$ starting in

$$< (V(T) \bigcup_{i=1}^{\kappa} R_i \bigcup_{j=1}^{\kappa} \bigcup_{i=1}^{\kappa-1} V(E_j^{(i)})) \setminus \{w_1^*, \dots, w_{\kappa-1}^*\} >$$

and terminating in $C \setminus \{w_1^*, \dots, w_{\kappa-1}^*\}$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{t+1}$ occurs on $\vec{C}$ in a consecutive order. Then it is easy to see that

$$c = \sum_{i=1}^{t+1} (|\xi_i \vec{C} \xi_{i+1}| - 1) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} \varphi_{v_i^*} + 2\kappa + \kappa\mu(T)$$

where $\xi_{t+2} = \xi_1$. Further, we can argue exactly as in case 1.1.1.

Case 1.2. $r \leq \kappa - 1$.

It follows that $t = r$. There are κ vertex-disjoint (H, C) -paths $E_i = v_i E_i w_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, \kappa$). Assume w.l.o.g. that $w_1, \dots, w_{\kappa}$ occurs on $\vec{C}$ in a consecutive order. Put

$$W = \{w_1, \dots, w_{\kappa}\}, \quad W^* = \{w_1^*, \dots, w_r^*\}.$$

Let $a, b \in \{1, \dots, \kappa\}$. Denote

$$W^*(a, b) = W^* \cap V(w_a \vec{C} w_b)$$

We will say that $w_a \vec{C} w_b$ is a suitable segment if

$$|w_a \vec{C} w_b| - 1 \geq \sum_{v_i^* \in W^*(a, b)} \varphi_{v_i^*} + 2(b - a) + \sum_{i=1}^{b-a} (|\Omega(\bar{v}_{a+i-1}, \bar{\bar{v}}_{a+i})| - 1),$$

where $\bar{v}_j, \bar{\bar{v}}_j \in \{v_j\} \cup \bar{U}_0$ ($j = 1, \dots, \kappa$).

Claim 1. Let $i \in \{1, \dots, \kappa\}$. If either $|W^*(i, i+1)| \neq 1$ or $|W^*(i, i+1)| = 1$ and $W^*(i, i+1) \cap \{w_i, w_{i+1}\} = \emptyset$, then $w_i \vec{C} w_{i+1}$ is suitable.

Proof of claim 1. **Case a1** $|W^*(i, i+1)| = 0$.

Let $T_{tr}(E_i, E_{i+1}) = (E'_i, E'_{i+1})$ and $T_{tr}(v_i, v_{i+1}) = (\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})$. Then $w_i \vec{C} w_{i+1}$ is suitable, since by (a1),

$$|w_i \vec{C} w_{i+1}| - 1 \geq 2 + (|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1).$$

Case a2. $|W^*(i, i+1)| \geq 2$.

Let E, F be any two elements of $\{E_1^*, \dots, E_r^*\}$ with $E = xEv, F = yFw$ for some $v, w \in W_i^*$. Since $T_{tr}(E, F) = (E, F)$ and $\{x, y\} \subseteq \bar{U}_0$, we have by (a1), $|v \vec{C} w| - 1 \geq \varphi_x + \varphi_y + 2 + (|\Omega(x, y)| - 1)$ implying that $w_i \vec{C} w_{i+1}$ is suitable.

Case a3. $|W^*(i, i+1)| = 1$.

Assume w.l.o.g. that $W^*(i, i+1) = \{w_1^*\}$. If either E_i or E_{i+1} (say E_i) has no vertex in common with E_1^* , then using transformation $T_{tr}(E_i, E_1^*) = (E'_i, E_1^*)$, we obtain by (a1),

$$|w_i \vec{C} w_{i+1}| - 1 \geq |w_i \vec{C} w_1^*| - 1 \geq \varphi_{v_1^*} + 2 + (|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1)$$

for some appropriate $\bar{v}_i \in \{v_i\} \cup \bar{U}_0$ and $\bar{v}_{i+1} = v_1^*$. It means that $w_i \vec{C} w_{i+1}$ is suitable. Now let both E_i and E_{i+1} have vertices in common with E_1^* . Walking along E_1^* from w_1^* to v_1^* we stop at the first vertex $v \in V(E_i) \cup V(E_{i+1})$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $v \in V(E_{i+1})$. Putting $E'_{i+1} = w_1^* E_1^* v E_{i+1} v_{i+1}$ and $T_{tr}(E_i, E'_{i+1}) = (E'_i, E''_{i+1})$, we see by (a1) that for some appropriate $\bar{v}_i \in \{v_i\} \cup \bar{U}_0$ and $\bar{v}_{i+1} \in \{v_{i+1}\} \cup \bar{U}_0$,

$$|w_i \vec{C} w_{i+1}| - 1 \geq |w_i \vec{C} w_1^*| - 1 \geq 2 + \varphi_{v_1^*} + (|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{v}_{i+1})| - 1).$$

So, again $w_i \vec{C} w_{i+1}$ is suitable. Δ

Claim 2. If $w_a \vec{C} w_b$ and $w_b \vec{C} w_e$ are suitable segments, then $|w_a \vec{C} w_e|$ is suitable as well.

Proof of claim 2. Immediate from the definition. Δ

Claim 3. Let $w_a \vec{C} w_b$ is a suitable segment. If $w_b \vec{C} w_{b+1}$ is not suitable and $W^*(b, b+1) = \{w_b\}$, then $w_a \vec{C} w_{b+1}$ is suitable.

Proof of claim 3. Immediate from the definition. Δ

Claim 4. Let $i \in \{1, \dots, \kappa\}$. If $W^*(i, i+1) \subseteq \{w_i, w_{i+1}\}$ and $|W^*(i, i+1)| = 1$ (say $W^*(i, i+1) = \{w_i\}$), then $w_{i-1} \vec{C} w_{i+1}$ is suitable.

Proof of claim 4. Assume w.l.o.g. that $W^*(i, i+1) = \{w_1^*\}$, i.e. $w_1^* = w_i$. If $|W^*(i-1, i)| \geq 2$, then by claims 1 and 3, $w_{i-1} \vec{C} w_{i+1}$ is suitable. Let $|W^*(i-1, i)| = 1$, i.e. $W^*(i-1, i) = \{w_1^*\}$. If either E_{i-1} or E_{i+1} (say E_{i-1}) has no vertices in common with E_1^* , then using transformations $T_{tr}(E_{i-1}, E_1^*)$ and $T_{tr}(E_i, E_{i+1})$, we see that $w_{i-1} \vec{C} w_i$ is suitable and by claim 3, $w_{i-1} \vec{C} w_{i+1}$ is suitable as well. Now let both E_{i-1} and E_{i+1} have vertices in common with E_1^* . Walking along E_1^* from w_1^* to v_1^* we stop at the first vertex $v \in V(E_{i-1}) \cup V(E_{i+1})$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $v \in V(E_{i+1})$. If $v = v_1^*$, i.e. $v_{i-1} = v_1^*$, then using $T_{tr}(E_{i-1}, w_i E_1^* v E_{i+1} v_{i+1})$ and $T_{tr}(E_i, w_{i+1} E_{i+1} v v_1^*)$ we see that $w_{i-1} \vec{C} w_i$ is suitable. By claim 3, $w_{i-1} \vec{C} w_{i+1}$ is suitable as well. Finally, if $v \neq v_1^*$ (i. e. $v_{i+1} \notin U_0$), then using $T_{tr}(E_{i-1}, w_i E_1^* v E_i v_{i+1})$ and $T_{tr}(E_i, E_{i+1})$, we see that $w_{i-1} \vec{C} w_i$ is suitable, implying by claim 3 that $w_{i-1} \vec{C} w_{i+1}$ is suitable as well. Δ

Claim 5. For appropriate $\bar{v}_i, \bar{v}_i \in \{v_i\} \cup \bar{U}_0$,

$$c = \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} (|w_i \vec{C} w_{i+1}| - 1) \geq \sum_{i=1}^r \varphi_{v_i^*} + 2\kappa + \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} (|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{v}_{i+1})| - 1).$$

Proof of claim 5. Suppose not. Let $i \in \{1, \dots, \kappa\}$. If $w_i \vec{C} w_{i+1}$ is not suitable, then by claims 1 and 4, either $w_{i-1} \vec{C} w_{i+1}$ or $w_i \vec{C} w_{i+2}$ is suitable. Thus there exist some suitable segment on C and let $w_a \vec{C} w_b$ be the longest one for some $a, b \in \{1, \dots, \kappa\}$ ($a \neq b$). If $w_b \vec{C} w_{b+1}$ is suitable, then by claim 2, $w_a \vec{C} w_{b+1}$ is suitable as well, a contradiction. Otherwise, by claims 3 and

4, $w_b \vec{C} w_{b+2}$ is suitable and hence (by claim 2) $w_a \vec{C} w_{b+2}$ is suitable as well, a contradiction. Δ

Claim 6. If $\kappa \geq 4$ and $h \geq 5$, then for appropriate $\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_i \in \{v_i\} \cup \bar{U}_0$ ($i = 1, \dots, \kappa$),

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} (|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1) \geq \kappa \mu(T).$$

Proof of claim 6. Assume w.l.o.g that $\beta_1 = \max_i \{\beta_i\}$. Put

$$A_0 = \{i \mid |\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1 \geq \beta_1\}, \quad A_1 = \{1, \dots, \kappa\} \setminus A_0, \\ A_{1j} = \{i \in A_1 \mid u_j \in \{\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1}\}\} \quad (j = 1, 2).$$

We can assume that $A_1 \neq \emptyset$, since otherwise by (i1),

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} (|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1) \geq \kappa \beta_1 \geq \kappa \mu(T).$$

If $\{\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1}\} = \{u_1, u_2\}$, then by (i8), $i \in A_0$. It means that $A_{11} \cap A_{12} = \emptyset$. On the other hand, by (i5), either $A_{11} = \emptyset$ or $A_{12} = \emptyset$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $A_{12} = \emptyset$, i.e. $A_1 = A_{11}$.

Case b1. $|A_{11}| \geq 4$.

Recalling definition 3.9, it is not hard to see that there are at least two paths among $E_1, \dots, E_{\kappa}$ having vertices in common with $V(T(u_1)) \setminus \{u_1\}$, i.e. $|T(u_1)| - 1 \geq 2$. By (i2), $A_1 = \emptyset$, a contradiction.

Case b2. $|A_{11}| = 3$.

It follows that at least one of the paths $E_1, \dots, E_{\kappa}$ has a vertex in common with $V(T(u_1)) \setminus \{u_1\}$, i.e. $|T(u_1)| - 1 \geq 1$. Clearly $|T(u_1)| - 1 = 1$, since otherwise $|A_{11}| \geq 4$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $A_1 = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $\bar{v}_1 = \bar{v}_2 = \bar{v}_3 = u_1$. If $\bar{v}_2 = \bar{v}_3 = \bar{v}_4$, then clearly $\bar{v}_1, \bar{v}_2 \in \bar{U}_0$ and by (i7), $|\Omega(\bar{v}_1, \bar{v}_2)| - 1 \geq \beta_1$, a contradiction. Otherwise, by (i4), $|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1 \geq \beta_1$ for some $i \in A_1$, again a contradiction. So, $1 \leq |A_{11}| \leq 2$.

Case b3. $|A_{11}| = 2$.

Case b3.1. $h \geq 8$.

Let $i \in A_1$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $\bar{v}_i = u_1, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1} = u_s$ for some $s \in \{1, \dots, h\}$. By (i1), $|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1 \geq \beta_j$ for each $j \in \{1, \dots, h\} \setminus \{1, h, s-1, s\}$. Since $h \geq 8$, there are at least four pairwise different integers f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4 in $\{1, \dots, h\} \setminus \{1, h, s-1, s\}$. By (i1), $|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1 \geq \beta_{f_j}$ ($j = 1, 2, 3, 4$). So,

$$\text{if } i \in A_1, \text{ then } |\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1 \geq \frac{1}{h} \left(\sum_{i=1}^h \beta_i - \beta_1 - \beta_h - \beta_{s-1} - \beta_s + \sum_{i=1}^4 \beta_{f_i} \right).$$

On the other hand,

$$\text{if } i \in A_0, \text{ then } |\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1 \geq \beta_1 = \frac{1}{h} \left(\sum_{i=1}^h \beta_i - \sum_{i=1}^h \beta_i + h\beta_1 \right). \quad (17)$$

Since $h\beta_1 - \beta_1 - \beta_h - \beta_{s-1} - \beta_s \geq \sum_{i=1}^h \beta_i - \sum_{i=1}^4 \beta_{f_i}$, we have

if $i \in A_0$, $j \in A_1$, then $|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1 + |\Omega(\bar{v}_j, \bar{\bar{v}}_{j+1})| - 1 \geq 2\mu(T)$.

Observing that $|A_0| \geq |A_1|$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} (|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1) &= \sum_{i \in A_0} (|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1) + \sum_{i \in A_1} (|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1) \\ &\geq (|A_0| - |A_1|)\mu(T) + 2|A_1|\mu(T) = (|A_0| + |A_1|)\mu(T) = \kappa\mu(T). \end{aligned}$$

Case b3.2. $6 \leq h \leq 7$.

Let $i \in A_1$. Assume w.l.o.g that $\bar{v}_i = u_1, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1} = u_s$ for some $s \in \{1, \dots, h\}$. We will write $i \in A_1^*$ if and only if $|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1 \geq \beta_j$ for some $j \in \{1, h, s-1, s\}$.

Case b3.2.1. $A_1 = A_1^*$.

Let $i \in A_1^*$ and let $\bar{v}_i = u_1, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1} = u_s$ ($s \in \{1, \dots, h\}$). By the definition, $|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1 \geq \beta_j$ for some $j \in \{h, s-1, s\}$, say $j = s$. Since $6 \leq h \leq 7$, there are at least three pairwise different integers f_1, f_2, f_3 in $\{1, \dots, h\} \setminus \{1, h, s-1\}$. By (i1), $|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1 \geq \max(\beta_{f_1}, \beta_{f_2}, \beta_{f_3})$. So,

$$\text{if } i \in A_1, \text{ then } |\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1 \geq \frac{1}{h} \left(\sum_{i=1}^h \beta_i - \beta_1 - \beta_h - \beta_{s-1} + \beta_{f_1} + \beta_{f_2} + \beta_{f_3} \right)$$

and hence we can argue exactly as in case $h \geq 8$.

Case b3.2.2. $A_1 \neq A_1^*$.

Let $A_1 = \{i, j\}$, where $i \notin A_1^*$ and let $\bar{v}_i = \bar{v}_j = u_1, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1} = u_s, \bar{\bar{v}}_{j+1} = u_r$ for some $s, r \in \{1, \dots, h\}$ ($s \leq r$). By (i8) and (i9), $4 \leq s \leq r \leq h-1$. If $s = r$, then it is easy to see (by definition 3.9) that either $u_1 \in \bar{U}_0$ or $u_s \in \bar{U}_0$ implying by (i6) that $i \in A_1^*$, a contradiction. So, assume $s \neq r$, i. e. $4 \leq s < r \leq h-1$.

Case b3.2.2.1. $h = 7$.

Case b3.2.2.1.1. $s = 4$ and $r = 5$.

By (i5), either $|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1 \geq \beta_4$ or $|\Omega(\bar{v}_j, \bar{\bar{v}}_{j+1})| - 1 \geq \beta_4$. Since $i \notin A_1^*$, we have $|\Omega(\bar{v}_j, \bar{\bar{v}}_{j+1})| - 1 \geq \beta_4$. Using (i1), we get

$$|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1 \geq \frac{1}{h} \left(\sum_{i=1}^7 \beta_i - \beta_1 - \beta_7 - \beta_3 - \beta_4 + 2\beta_2 + \beta_5 + \beta_6 \right),$$

$$|\Omega(\bar{v}_j, \bar{\bar{v}}_{j+1})| - 1 \geq \frac{1}{h} \left(\sum_{i=1}^7 \beta_i - \beta_1 - \beta_7 - \beta_5 + 2\beta_3 + \beta_6 \right).$$

Using also all $\kappa - 2$ inequalities of type (17), we obtain the desired result as in case $h \geq 8$.

Case b3.2.2.1.2. $s = 4$ and $r = 6$.

By (i1) and (i9),

$$|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1 \geq \frac{1}{h}(\sum_{i=1}^7 \beta_i - \beta_1 - \beta_7 - \beta_3 - \beta_4 + 2\beta_2 + \beta_5 + \beta_6),$$

$$|\Omega(\bar{v}_j, \bar{\bar{v}}_{j+1})| - 1 \geq \frac{1}{h}(\sum_{i=1}^7 \beta_i - \beta_1 - \beta_5 + \beta_3 + \beta_4).$$

Apply the arguments in case b3.2.2.1.1.

Case b3.2.2.1.3. $s = 5$ and $r = 6$.

By (i1), (i5) and (i9),

$$|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1 \geq \frac{1}{h}(\sum_{i=1}^7 \beta_i - \beta_1 - \beta_7 - \beta_4 - \beta_5 + 2\beta_2 + \beta_3 + \beta_6),$$

$$|\Omega(\bar{v}_j, \bar{\bar{v}}_{j+1})| - 1 \geq \frac{1}{h}(\sum_{i=1}^7 \beta_i - \beta_1 - \beta_5 + \beta_3 + \beta_4).$$

Apply the arguments in case b3.2.2.1.1.

Case b3.2.2.2. $h = 6$.

Clearly $s = 4, r = 5$. By (i1), (i5) and (i9),

$$\begin{aligned} |\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1 &\geq \frac{1}{h}(\sum_{i=1}^6 \beta_i - \beta_1 - \beta_6 - \beta_3 - \beta_4 + 2\beta_2 + 2\beta_5), \\ |\Omega(\bar{v}_j, \bar{\bar{v}}_{j+1})| - 1 &\geq \frac{1}{h}(\sum_{i=1}^6 \beta_i - \beta_1 + \beta_3). \end{aligned}$$

Apply the arguments in case b3.2.2.1.1.

Case b3.3. $h = 5$.

Let $A_1 = \{i, j\}$ and $\bar{v}_i = \bar{v}_j = u_1$, $\bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1} = u_s$, $\bar{\bar{v}}_{j+1} = u_r$ for some $s, r \in \{1, \dots, h\}$ ($s \leq r$). By (i8) and (i9), $s = r = 4$ and we can reach a contradiction as in case b3.2.2.

Case b4. $|A_{11}| = 1$.

Let $A_{11} = \{i\}$ and $\bar{v}_i = u_1$, $\bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1} = u_s$ for some $s \in \{1, \dots, h\}$.

Case b4.1. $h = 5$.

By (i8) and (i9), $s = 4$. Also, by (i1) and (i9),

$$|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1 \geq \frac{1}{5}(\sum_{i=1}^5 \beta_i - \beta_1 - \beta_3 + \beta_2 + \beta_4).$$

Apply the arguments in case b3.2.2.1.1.

Case b4.2. $h \geq 6$.

There are at least two distinct integers f_1, f_2 in $\{1, \dots, h\} - \{1, h, s-1, s\}$.

By (i1),

$$|\Omega(\bar{v}_i, \bar{\bar{v}}_{i+1})| - 1 \geq \frac{1}{h}(\sum_{i=1}^h \beta_i - \beta_1 - \beta_h - \beta_{s-1} - \beta_s + 2\beta_{f_1} + 2\beta_{f_2}).$$

Since $|A_0| \geq 4 - |A_1| = 3$, we have at least two inequalities of type (17). So, we can argue as in case b3.2.2.1.1. Δ

By claims 5 and 6, $c \geq \sum_{i=1}^r \varphi_{v_i^*} + 2\kappa + \kappa\mu(T)$ and the result follows as in case 1.1.1.1.

Case 2. $\kappa \geq 4, h \leq 4$.

Since $h \geq \kappa$, we have $h = \kappa = 4$. Then there are four vertex-disjoint (H, C) -paths. It can be easily checked that $c \geq 18$. If $\delta \leq 6$, then $c \geq 18 \geq 20(\delta + 2)/9 = (h + 1)\kappa(\delta + 2)/(h + \kappa + 1)$. Let $\delta \geq 7$. Using (d3) we can show that $\varphi_i \leq 3$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, i.e. $\max_i \psi_i \geq \delta - 3$. Then by lemma 3, $c \geq \sum_{i=1}^4 (\delta - \varphi_i) + \delta - 3 = 5\delta - 3 - \sum_{i=1}^4 \varphi_i$. If $\sum_{i=1}^4 \varphi_i \leq 12$, then $c \geq 5\delta - 15 \geq (h + 1)\kappa(\delta + 2)/(h + \kappa + 1)$. So, it suffices to prove $\sum_{i=1}^4 \varphi_i \leq 12$.

Case 2.1. Either $|U_0| = 0$ or $|U_0| = 4$.

It follows that $\varphi_i \leq 3$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

Case 2.2. $|U_0| = 3$.

Assume w.l.o.g. that $\overline{U}_0 = \{u_1\}$. If $u_3 \overset{0}{u}_1 \notin E$, then it is easy to see that $\varphi_i \leq 3$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Otherwise $(u_3 \overset{0}{u}_1 \in E)$, $u_2 u_4 \notin E$ and hence $\varphi_1 \leq 3, \varphi_3 \leq 4, \varphi_2 \leq 2$ and $\varphi_4 \leq 2$.

Case 2.3. $|U_0| = 2$.

By symmetry, we can distinguish the following two cases.

Case 2.3.1. $\overline{U}_0 = \{u_1, u_4\}$.

If $u_3 \overset{0}{u}_1 \notin E$ and $u_2 \overset{0}{u}_4 \notin E$, then clearly $\varphi_i \leq 3$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $u_3 \overset{0}{u}_1 \in E$. We can assume also $u_2 \overset{0}{u}_4 \notin E$, since otherwise the cycle $u_1 \overset{0}{u}_1 u_3 u_4 \overset{0}{u}_4 u_2 u_1$ is larger than H , which is impossible. Then clearly $\varphi_1 \leq 3, \varphi_4 \leq 3, \varphi_3 \leq 4$ and $\varphi_2 \leq 2$.

Case 2.3.2. $\overline{U}_0 = \{u_1, u_3\}$.

It is easy to see that $\varphi_i \leq 3$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

Case 2.4. $|U_0| = 1$.

Returning to the proof of lemma 3, we can see that in this special case the lower bound in lemma 3 can be improved by a unit. So, it suffices to show $\sum_{i=1}^4 \varphi_i \leq 13$. Denoting $U_0 = \{u_4\}$, we see that $\varphi_1 \leq 3, \varphi_2 \leq 3, \varphi_3 \leq 3, \varphi_4 \leq 4$ and the result holds immediately.

Case 3. $\kappa \leq 3$.

Claim 7. Let $\kappa \in \{2, 3\}$ and $h \geq \kappa$. If there are no $\kappa + 1$ vertex-disjoint (H, C) -paths, then $c \geq \min(\kappa(h + 1), \kappa(\delta - \kappa + 4))$.

Proof of claim 7. Case d1. $\kappa = 3$.

Assume w.l.o.g. that E_1, E_2 and E_3 are T -transformed. We now prove that $|w_1 \overrightarrow{C} w_2| - 1 \geq \min(h + 1, \delta + 1)$. If $v_2 = v_1^+$, then clearly

$$|w_1 \overrightarrow{C} w_2| - 1 \geq |w_1 E_1 v_1 \overleftarrow{H} v_2 E_2 w_2| - 1 \geq h + 1.$$

Let $v_2 \neq v_1^+$. Walking along $\overrightarrow{H}$ from v_1 to v_2^- we stop at the first vertex z with either $\hat{z} w_2 \in E$ or $\hat{z} w_1 \notin E$ or $z = v_2^-$. If $\hat{z} w_2 \in E$ or $z = v_2^-$, then clearly $|w_1 \overrightarrow{C} w_2| - 1 \geq h + 1$. Let $\hat{z} w_2 \in E$ and $\hat{z} w_1 \notin E$. If $\hat{z} w \in E$ for some $w \in V(C) \setminus \{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$, then there are 4 vertex-disjoint (H, C) -paths, contradicting our assumption. So, $N(\hat{z}) \cap V(C) \subseteq \{w_3\}$, i.e. $\varphi_z \geq \delta - 1$ and $h \geq \varphi_z + 1 \geq \delta$. By (g6), $|O(z^-, v_2)| - 1 \geq \gamma_z \geq \varphi_z \geq \delta - 1$ implying that

$|w_1 \vec{C} w_2| - 1 \geq \delta + 2$. Thus we have proved $|w_1 \vec{C} w_2| - 1 \geq \min(h + 1, \delta + 1)$. By symmetry, we have similar inequalities for segments $w_2 \vec{C} w_3$ and $w_3 \vec{C} w_1$ and the result holds from $h + 1 \geq \delta + 1$.

Case d2. $\kappa = 2$.

Apply the arguments in case 1. Claim 7 is proved. Δ

Case 3.1. $\kappa = 3$.

We can assume that there are no 4 vertex-disjoint (H, C) -paths, since otherwise

$$c \geq \frac{(h+1)4}{h+4+1}(\delta+2) > \frac{(h+1)\kappa}{h+\kappa+1}(\delta+2).$$

Then by claim 7 we can distinguish the following two cases.

Case 3.1.1. $c \geq 3(h+1)$.

If $h \geq \delta - 2$, then $c \geq 3(h+1) \geq 3(h+1)(\delta+2)/(h+4)$. Otherwise, the result holds from $c \geq 3(\delta-1)$ (see [?]).

Case 3.1.2. $c \geq 3(\delta+1)$.

If $h \leq 3\delta + 2$, then $c \geq 3(\delta+1) \geq 3(h+1)(\delta+2)/(h+4)$. Let $h \geq 3(\delta+1)$. Observing that $c \geq 3(h/2+2)$ (by standard arguments) we obtain the result immediately.

Case 3.2. $\kappa = 2$.

Apply the arguments in case 1.

Thus we have proved the theorem for h the length of a longest cycle in $G \setminus C$. Observing that

$$c \geq \frac{(h+1)\kappa}{h+\kappa+1}(\delta+2) > \frac{(h'+1)\kappa}{h'+\kappa+1}(\delta+2)$$

for any $h' < h$, we complete the proof of the theorem. Δ

Acknowledgment

The author is very grateful to N. K. Khachatryan for his careful reading and his corrections for the manuscript.

References

- [1] J. A. Bondy and U. S. R. Murty, Graph Theory with Applications. Macmillan, London and Elsevier, New York (1976).
- [2] G. A. Dirac, Some theorems on abstract graphs, Proc. London, Math. Soc., 2 (1952), 69–81.
- [3] Zh.G.Nikoghosyan, On maximal cycle of a graph, DAN Arm.SSR v.LXXII 2 (1981) 82-87 (in Russian).

- [4] Zh. G. Nikoghosyan, Path-Extensions and Long Cycles in Graphs, Transactions of the Institute for Informatics and Automation Problems of the NAS of RA and of the Yerevan State University, Mathematical Problems of Computer Science 19 (1998), 25-31.
- [5] Zh. G. Nikoghosyan, Cycle-Extensions and Long Cycles in Graphs, Transactions of the Institute for Informatics and Automation Problems of the NAS of RA and of the Yerevan State University, Mathematical Problems of Computer Science 21 (2000), 121-128.
- [6] H.-J. Voss and C. Zuluaga, Maximale gerade und ungerade Kreise in Graphen I, Wiss. Z. Tech. Hochschule Ilmenau, 23 (1977) 57-70.